DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 780 HE 015 166

AUTHOR	Baldwin, Roger; And Others
TITLE	Expanding Faculty Options: Career Development Projects at Colleges and Universities.
INSTITUTION	American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.; Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.
PUB DATE	81
NOTE	114p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, DC 20036 (Members, $4.00; Nonmembers, $5.50).
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Career Change; *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Consortia; Educational Demand; Enrollment Trends; *Faculty Development; Financial Support; Higher Education; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; Private Colleges; *Professional Development; Program Costs; Program Descriptions; Scholarship; State Colleges; Teacher Morale; Teacher Role; Teacher Supply and Demand; *Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS	Dallas County Community College District TX; De Anza College CA; Great Lakes Colleges Association MI; Lansing Community College MI; Maricopa Community College AZ; Miami Dade Community College FL; Prince Georges Community College MD; Program Objectives; Regis College CO

ABSTRACT

Based on a survey of colleges and universities, information is presented on faculty career development efforts. In addition, the following articles are presented: "Reexamining Academic Careers as a Legitimate Process," (Janet Hagberg); "Designing New Roles within Academe," (Thomas Maher); "Designing New Roles in Off-Campus Settings," (Louis Brakeman); "The Need to Rethink Faculty Careers," (Russell Edgerton); and "Planning and Action on Campus: A Note on the Study," (Roger Baldwin). For each of the projects information is presented on the need for the project and its main elements, program outcomes, costs and funding sources, and available materials. The following career planning projects are described: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges and Associated Schools of the Pacific Northwest; Gordon College, Massachusetts; and Pennsylvania State Colleges Educational Trust Fund. The following respecialization and retraining projects are described: California State University, Long Beach; College of Saint Scholastica, Minnesota; Mary College, North Dakota; and the University of Wisconsin System. The following experiential projects (internships and exchanges are described: Birmingham-Southern College, Alabama; Educational Ventures Inc.--Cedar Crest and Muhlenberg Colleges, Pennsylvania; Furman University, South Carolina; and University of Kansas. The following multidimensional and comprehensive career services projects are described: Concordia College, Minnesota; Illinois State University; Linfield College, Oregon; Loyola University, Illinois; Rochester Area Colleges, Inc., New York; and Western Michigan University. Two academic career transition projects, six community college projects, and information on a planning project are also included. (SW)

ED217780

EXPANDING FACULTY OPTIONS

Career Development Projects At Colleges and Universities

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

American Association
for Higher Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE015166

Contributors: Roger Baldwin
Louis Brakeman • Russell Edgerton
Janet Hagberg • Thomas Maher

American Association for Higher Education

AAHE

© 1981, American Association for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 780
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/293-6440
Printed in the United States of America

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, provided financial support for the preparation of this report. The Lilly Endowment funded the conference for which the essays in chapter 3 were prepared and provided support for the dissemination of this report. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of FIPSE, the Department, or the Lilly Endowment.

Contents

1 **The Need to Rethink Faculty Careers**—*Russell Edgerton*

5 **Planning and Action On Campus**—*Roger Baldwin*

5 A Note on the Study

7 Creating the Climate: Planning in the Great Lakes Colleges Association

10 Career Planning Projects
  10 Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges and Associated Schools of the Pacific Northwest
  12 Gordon College
  15 Pennsylvania State Colleges Educational Trust Fund
  19 Summary Chart

20 Respecialization/Retraining Projects
  20 California State University, Long Beach
  21 The College of Saint Scholastica
  24 Mary College
  26 University of Wisconsin System
  30 Summary Chart

31 Experiential Projects: Internships and Exchanges
  31 Birmingham-Southern College
  34 Educational Ventures Inc.—Cedar Crest and Muhlenberg Colleges
  37 Furman University
  40 University of Kansas
  43 Summary Chart

45 Multidimensional/Comprehensive Career Services
  45 Concordia College
  47 Illinois State University
  50 Linfield College
  53 Loyola University
  56 Rochester Area Colleges, Inc.
  59 Western Michigan University
  63 Summary Chart

67 Academic Career Transition Projects
  69 Scholars in Transition
  70 Regis College

72 The Community College Sector: A Special Look
  72 Prince George's Community College
  73 Lansing Community College
  73 Maricopa Community College

    74 Miami-Dade Community College
    74 Dallas County Community College District
    75 De Anza College

77 Retrospect

79 Designing New Projects
79 Reexamining Academic Careers as a Legitimate Process—*Janet Hagberg*
87 Designing New Roles Within Academe—*Thomas Maher*
99 Designing New Roles in Off-Campus Settings—*Louis Brakeman*

105 Resources
105 Literature
107 Resource Persons

Foreword

In April 1979, the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) held its annual national conference on the theme, "The Academic Workforce: Opportunities for Professional Renewal." Rosabeth Kanter, professor of sociology at Yale, keynoted this conference and offered what was for us a new perspective on the age-old challenge of faculty renewal. What was needed, she argued, was a fundamental rethinking of our assumptions about the structure of academic careers and the nature of academic work.

We picked up on this perspective after the conference and began investigating what colleges were doing to enhance the careers of the 800,000 or so faculty who constitute the academic profession. The concept of "career," which means course or road, directed our attention beyond the issues faculty confront in their current roles, to the prospects awaiting faculty down their individual career paths. This, in turn, illuminated for us a new set of problems which are set forth in chapter one. The solution to these problems, it seemed, lay in opening up new career options both within and outside academe.

This, however, sounds tidier than it actually was, for our understanding of these issues evolved over time. With a small planning grant from the Lilly Endowment, we convened 12 people in November 1979 at the Spring Hill Conference Center near Minneapolis to brainstorm the issues associated with our new concern for faculty growth opportunities during the course of their careers. The "Spring Hill group," in turn, provided the leadership for an informal session on "new options for mid-career faculty," at AAHE's March 1980 annual meeting. To our surprise, more than 100 individuals showed up for this meeting. We knew we were on to something.

In July 1980, the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education awarded us a grant for a quick study of what colleges are doing to facilitate the creation of new career options. The Lilly Endowment provided a grant for a second convening of practitioners and researchers interested in this issue. So in November 1980 we held "Spring Hill II," this time with 37 in attendance.

This report is the product of these activities. We do not consider it a comprehensive survey of faculty career development efforts, nor a full exposition of all the issues. What the report does do is chart the range of practices that seem to be current, and raise some of the questions that need to be taken into account by those interested in developing their own projects and programs.

The principal staff work on this report was done by Roger Baldwin, who joined AAHE's national office to carry out the

FIPSE-funded portion of the investigation. When Roger arrived to do the study, he profited immensely from a set of files and a marvelous network of people built up by Leslie Hornig, formerly a college intern with AAHE and now a program officer with FIPSE, and David Potter, academic program coordinator with the Virginia Council of Higher Education who worked with AAHE during a fellowship leave.

Our largest debt is to the individuals who came together at Spring Hill, shared their ideas, and formed the nucleus of an "invisible college" on faculty career development. To single out but a few (their titles and addresses appear in the list of resource persons at the end of the report): Bill Toombs helped us think through our initial approach. Louis Brakeman, Janet Hagberg, and Thomas Maher prepared working papers for the Spring Hill II conference, revised and included in this report; they, along with Gene Rice helped plan the meeting and analyze the results. Jon Fuller offered counsel and support throughout the project. Bob Barry's living illustration at Loyola University of what can be done, and his own humanitarianism, inspired us all.

The personal and professional rewards from being associated with this particular invisible college have been considerable, and we hope others will join us.

Russell Edgerton
President
American Association for Higher Education
August 1981

The Need to Rethink Faculty Careers

Russell Edgerton

The demoralized profession

Large numbers of faculty in colleges and universities across the country are going about the motions of teaching and research without energy, enthusiasm, or a sense of purpose. This is an old problem in higher education, but we think its character is changing. New circumstances have altered what the sources of the problems are, and what responses should be taken. To explain these changes, we conceive the vitality and morale of faculty to be influenced by their personal histories as faculty members, their current roles, and their future prospects.

Personal histories: great expectations. The majority of faculty now teaching are in the middle years of their careers. They became instructors and assistant professors during the incredible boom years of the late-'50s, '60s, and early-'70s. The key point about the personal histories of today's faculty is that they entered their profession with expectations generated during these times of unprecedented growth. It was also a time when the general culture glorified the contributions experts could make to our national life.

Current roles: giving more and getting less. Now, in 1981, there is a great disparity between the expectations held by these faculty and the realities of their current roles. Faculty are "giving more and getting less." Many faculty are confronting students who are, by previous standards, poorly prepared for college work. Ninety-six percent of the faculty believe that students with whom they have close contact are seriously deficient in basic skills (Ladd 1979). Hence, faculty are giving more as teachers. They are giving more as employees as colleges become more contentious and bureaucratized. At the same time, salaries are not keeping up with inflation, and faculty are getting less in terms of general appreciation for their work.

Prospects: constricted futures. We can put up with things if we think that we will be moving on, that the future will be better or at least different. Faculty, however, are now part of what is becoming an immobilized profession. Overall, demand for services is slackening. A large percentage of the faculty are middle-aged and tenured; and older faculty have an option to stay longer, given the federal prohibition against mandatory retirement until age 70.

What this means is that current faculty are closed-off from what has traditionally been the most important means of growth and advancement: interinstitutional mobility. Faculty now have few opportunities to change locales and enhance their status by moving "up" to a more prestigious institution. Opportunities for professional development also are waning. Funds for time off, special projects, travel to professional meetings, and other means of renewal are disappearing as more and more colleges face the need to reduce costs. Essentially, the "sense of mobility" has disappeared, and many faculty have come to realize that they may be spending the next 20 to 25 years right where they are—and they feel trapped.

Finally, past prosperity and interinstitutional mobility obscured another problem that now is becoming apparent: *Within* a given college or university, there aren't that many rungs in the career ladder, or other opportunities for advancement. Once a professor has climbed the all-or-nothing rung of tenure, he or she has just about exhausted the formal reward system, especially when salaries are flattened by budget pressures. Moving into administration is the one "second career" that has been open, but, as Kanter (1979) points out, college administration is a pyramid with only a limited number of top jobs to go around.

In sum, we see a situation where faculty are disengaging from their academic work, with serious consequences for the quality of their teaching and general commitment to their institutions.

Fixed faculty, shifting enrollments

During the 1970's, there were striking shifts in undergraduate student enrollments across academic fields. According to a Carnegie Foundation study, *Missions of the College Curriculum*, between 1969 and 1976 enrollment in the professions increased from 38 percent to 58 percent of total enrollment; enrollment in the social sciences dropped from 18 percent to 8 percent of total enrollment; and enrollment in the humanities dropped from 9 percent to 5 percent of total enrollment. But during the same years, the percentages of faculty employed in these fields were much more stable. Faculty in the professions increased from 32 percent to 37 percent; in the social sciences they stayed the same at 12 percent; and in the humanities, faculty dropped one percentage point—from 20 percent to 19 percent.

This documents what we all know: Colleges are not like businesses, which can phase out one product line and dismiss staff in this or that division, or simply shift them to a new area. The students shift, but the professors tend to stay in their specialities. Within the same college we can have boom times in the business school and severe retrenchment in the classics department.

Comes the 1980s, and the much-ballyhooed decline in the overall numbers of college entrants. According to the Carnegie Foundation, the first slide in overall enrollments will begin in the fall of 1983 and extend to 1987. The fact that this slide comes *on top of* a period of considerable internal shifts means that we are entering a time when dislocations and mismatches between faculty expertise and student interests will be a major problem.

A solution: new faculty career options

During the 1970s, many faculty were personally boosted, and their contributions to teaching and scholarship were improved, through a variety of activities frequently labeled "faculty development" or "professional development." These activities included released time to do research or develop a new course, access to professional meetings, workshops on teaching improvement, and so on. But for those faculty who are feeling trapped, it's the sameness of their lives which is at issue. What they need is a chance to diversify—to change, at least for awhile, what they do every day.

This observation is reinforced by the new knowledge and understanding we now have about adult development. Sheehy's *Passages* (1976), Levinson's *Seasons of a Man's Life* (1978), and Gould's *Transformations* (1978) are examples of this new research. Students and scholars of higher education, such as Baldwin, Hodgkinson, Mathis, and Toombs, have begun to apply these insights to the field of faculty development. The message is that faculty development needs to be "deeper": We can't deal with an individual in one role alone, but must understand him or her as a whole person. The second message is that faculty at mid-career face the dilemma of spending energy to maintain their career on essentially the same terms that brought them to the midpoint in the first place. As Baldwin (1979) notes, it is a time when faculty are faced with a choice of *stagnation or diversification*.

In short, to revitalize the faculty, we need to think more dramatically about the options available to them. The agenda is not simply "more professional development" but the nature and structure of faculty careers. Must faculty remain forever prisoners of their knowledge speciality? Are their legitimate alternatives to the full-time, continuous teacher/scholar role? Need we consider teaching/scholarship itself as a lifelong career commitment?

And for those faculty who are in underenrolled departments, we need to think more creatively about *new uses* of faculty talent. Can they be used to help address the critical needs of the underprepared students who lack essential skills? Can they become part of new efforts to reach out to adults in off-campus settings? Can they be encouraged to consider internships in non-academic settings before the issue becomes one of being forced to find a new job?

Each of these questions probably has numerous answers. The most appropriate responses, of course, depend on individual and institutional circumstances. Meaningful new opportunities for faculty at one college may be too costly or irrelevant at another institution. The case studies we have assembled in the next chapter show how a variety of colleges and universities attempt to broaden the career options available to their faculties. We trust that the experiences of these schools will provide useful models for other higher education institutions confronting their versions of the same issues.

Planning and Action On Campus

Roger Baldwin

A Note on the Study

During the five-month period, from September 1980 to January 1981, we searched for campus-based projects that were explicitly focused on generating new career options for college faculty. This search included:

- An appeal for information through the *AAHE Bulletin;*
- Letters to a network of about 100 individuals known to be interested in issues of faculty career development;
- Letters to well-traveled and knowledgeable higher education leaders in each region of the country;
- A search through the grant recipient lists of foundations with major grant programs in higher education;
- Phone calls and letters to directors of established faculty development programs.

During this process, we decided that the community college sector was not being adequately scanned. Accordingly, we employed a consultant, Dr. Lucille Shandloff, to conduct a special telephone investigation of community college leaders to inquire about project activity in their sector.

Our investigation probably missed some significant efforts to expand faculty career options. However, given the extent of our search, we feel confident that we have picked up the *major types* of projects that have been initiated.

We have made no attempt to evaluate the strengths or weaknesses of the projects described here. If evaluative comments are reported, they are the judgments of individuals who are personally familiar with the projects. Our objective is simply to describe the range of activity that seems to be happening.

We have grouped most of the projects according to their primary means of addressing the need for career development. We identified four major types of projects:

- Career assessment and planning projects
- Respecialization and retraining projects
- Experiential projects such as exchanges and internships
- Comprehensive/multi-dimensional projects

In addition to these four general types of activity, we took a special look at projects in two particular areas:

- Projects to prepare new academics for career transitions
- Projects to expand the options of community college faculty

The growing number of academic career transition programs seems worthy of special attention. Most of the programs we uncovered serve primarily a population of advanced graduate students and recent Ph.D's. Each of these programs, described beginning on page 67, helps individuals with traditional academic credentials to transfer their skills to the nonacademic world. It seems to us that the lessons learned from these initial career transition programs have relevance for faculty at all career stages.

Our survey of the community college sector produced fragments of activity but few firmly established, ongoing projects. We combined our findings into one section to focus more clearly on the types of career development initiatives that may benefit two-year college faculty. These initiatives are summarized beginning on page 72.

Creating the Climate: Planning in the Great Lakes Colleges Association

Career development planning and career transition are essentially foreign concepts in the academic workplace. The "one life, one career imperative" described by Sarason (1977) frequently restricts the vocational development of college and university faculty. In addition, many people in higher education have not yet acknowledged a close relationship between individual career development and institutional vitality. Hence, for maximum effectiveness, efforts to promote academic career renewal may require a preliminary period of consciousness-raising and careful planning.

The Great Lakes Colleges Association recently spent a year considering the career development needs of faculty in its member institutions. GLCA's planning experience is instructive of the kind of groundwork that should precede the implementation of formal academic career development initiatives.

The Great Lakes Colleges Association is a voluntary consortium of 12 private liberal arts colleges in Ohio, Michigan, and Indiana. For 20 years the member colleges have cooperated to "expand and enhance the academic opportunities available to faculty members and to students" (Proposal to FIPSE). The consortium has maintained an active faculty development program since 1974. Each year GLCA sponsors a series of seminars, workshops, and conferences designed to improve faculty performance as teachers, scholars, and counselors.

Why was the project initiated?

Conversations among GLCA faculty and academic deans surfaced a growing concern for the future career prospects of the consortium's faculty. No matter how desirable their current positions, many mid-career faculty realized that they would probably continue "teaching in the same college, in the same small town, with the same few departmental colleagues, and doing that with gradually declining compensation and, possibly, a decline in the quality of their students. . . ." Although concern for faculty morale had not reached "crisis proportions," the consortium members concluded that they should address the subject before it threatened educational quality. Because of its previous success with cooperative faculty development activities, GLCA's members decided to explore how they might address, individually and collectively, the complex problems facing their mid-career faculty.

What are the program's principal elements?
The Lilly Endowment awarded GLCA a one-year planning grant to gather information and assess alternative courses of action. The consortium's first initiative was to appoint a planning committee representing the range of disciplines, ages, and other experiences relevant to the issues being addressed. The committee's initial objective was to reach a common understanding of the problem and then to develop a range of appropriate responses. However, on the home campuses, committee members also were expected to promote thinking and discussion about faculty career issues. The Committee on Faculty Career Renewal recognized that career development problems are often hidden concerns. Hence, they hoped that their efforts would make career planning and career change legitimate issues for GLCA faculty to consider.

Throughout the course of its planning year the Committee on Faculty Career Renewal engaged in numerous developmental activities. The Committee investigated existing academic career renewal programs to get ideas adaptable to the liberal arts college setting. David Marker, provost of Hope College, collected comparative information on college policies that influence—either encourage or inhibit—faculty career development. Louis Brakeman, provost of Denison University, used his sabbatical leave to study potential growth opportunities for faculty in nonacademic settings. He investigated ways to set up faculty internships and consulting arrangements in business, government, and other noncollegiate organizations.

The Committee also commissioned a series of biographies of faculty who had made significant transitions during the course of their careers. Jon Fuller, GLCA president, explains that this project "was predicated on the knowledge that many faculty members are relatively private people who prefer to make many of their own decisions based on reading and reflection rather than in group discussions and workshops."

The Committee supplemented its developmental projects with efforts to generate interest and promote discussion of career renewal among faculty on the 12 GLCA campuses. A survey of interest in the academic career development issue appeared in the consortium's *Faculty Newsletter* and generated substantial response. The Committee reported on its explorations at various GLCA meetings. These status reports often provided a mechanism to open discussion of the topic. Articles reporting on the Committee's activities and raising particular faculty career issues were included in the *Faculty Newsletter*.

The Committee summarized its year's work in a weekend retreat for faculty from the member colleges. The participants reacted to proposed program initiatives and gave suggestions for future project directions. Many of those attending the retreat were campus leaders who hold important assignments on committees responsible for the issues under consideration.

What are the program's outcomes?

Early into its planning year the GLCA Committee on Faculty Career Renewal recognized the complexity of the problems it hoped to address. "We realized that there would be no quick or easy solutions, and that we must not expect or promise too much too soon." explains the project's report to the Lilly Endowment. In spite of this dose of cold reality, the project produced positive results. The year's conversations and reports have created a readiness among many faculty and administrators to address academic career development issues "in a serious and comprehensive way." By including faculty leaders and administrators in the preliminary planning process, the project clarified what potential changes in policies and support services are most appropriate for faculty in a liberal arts college consortium. Perhaps most important, the relaxed, deliberative planning period enabled the Committee to develop understanding and support among influential faculty and administrators. These are the individuals who can legitimize and build momentum for efforts to examine, revise, and revitalize the careers of college faculty. By taking time for thoughtful study and discussion, the Great Lakes Colleges Association has created a climate receptive to career development initiatives. The consortium and its member colleges are now much better prepared to take effective action on this issue than they were just one year ago.

What are the program's costs and funding sources?

Expenses for the planning year included travel and lodging costs for committee members and retreat participants, consultant fees, and some support for central office staff. The Lilly Endowment planning grant funded these expenditures.

For further information contact:

Dr. Jon W. Fuller, president, Great Lakes Colleges Association, 220 Collingwood, Suite 240, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103.

Career Planning Projects

Several higher education institutions and systems encourage their faculty members to engage in systematic career assessment and planning. Career planning projects are based on the assumption that successful and satisfying career growth requires careful analysis of one's abilities and goals. It also assumes that faculty will be most successful if they devise detailed plans for achieving their career objectives. There are many ways to facilitate professional growth through career planning activities. The following descriptions outline career planning programs in three different settings—a single institution, a state college system, and a regionally based group of private colleges.

Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges and Associated Schools of the Pacific Northwest

Tacoma, Washington

The program, In Support of Career Planning and Development, is a multi-institution effort to help college faculty plan their future career development. Seventeen private colleges in the North Central and Pacific Northwest regions of the United States participate. The program is sponsored jointly by the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges (CASC) and the Associated Schools of the Pacific Northwest (ASPN). CASC is a national association providing extensive services for small, independent liberal arts colleges. ASPN is a five-college consortium of institutions in Oregon and Washington.

Why was the program initiated?

Changing economic and social conditions will probably encourage more and more faculty to reexamine, and in some cases change, their careers. Hence, the designers of this program believed that all faculty could benefit from an experience in career and life planning. The program is an effort to assist faculty in the process of career assessment and transition. In particular, it focuses on the concerns of three faculty groups:

1. Faculty who probably will not receive academic tenure and will face an involuntary career crisis.
2. Mid-career faculty (aged 36-45) who may be forced to teach at the same institution for 20 to 30 more years.
3. Senior faculty members who need help to make a successful transition to retirement.

Ongoing faculty renewal is the primary objective of the program. By introducing the concept of systematic career planning, it is hoped that the program will encourage individual colleges to increase and institutionalize support for academic career development.

What are the program's principal elements?

The program was designed to evolve during three phases. Phase I was a period of data collection and planning. During this phase the original program design was revised to reflect the interests and concerns of administrators and faculty. As a result of Phase I preparations, the program's scope was broadened, and its title was changed. "In Support of Alternate Careers" became "In Support of Career Planning and Development." Originally a service for faculty wishing to change careers, the program was expanded to include all faculty who desired to participate in a career assessment and planning experience.

Actual implementation of the program occurs during Phase II. This phase includes four major components:

1. A core experience in career planning—an intensive, three-day workshop to help faculty "gain a fuller understanding of their current life situation [and develop] plans for the next steps in their lives and careers . . . " The workshop consists of self-assessment and goal setting exercises, including the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory.
2. Follow-up faculty workshops—to serve faculty who have specific career development needs. Workshop content will be based largely on the needs identified by participants in the core planning workshops. Likely topics include retirement planning, job change strategies, and family counseling.
3. Administrative support group workshops—to help administrative personnel support the growth and development of faculty. One workshop will consider ways administrators can work one-to-one with faculty on career assessment and planning. Another workshop will instruct administrators on long-range financial and retrenchment planning.
4. Faculty support groups and career change networks—small support groups based on geographic or vocational interest "to provide the personal and interpersonal support so important" to people in career transition. In addition, faculty networks of this sort should help career changers to identify appropriate new professional opportunities.

Phase III will consist of an evaluation of the program. Assessment of its success will be based on evaluation of the workshops and a follow-up of workshop participants. A final evaluation conference will permit each participating institution to discuss the local impact of the program.

What are the program's outcomes?

At this writing, the implementation phase of the program is still underway. Thus, it is too early to identify concrete outcomes or assess the program's level of success. By mid-February, 75 faculty had participated in core workshops. The project ends in June 1981.

What are the program's costs and funding sources?

The program is supported by a $130,000 grant from the Northwest Area Foundation. Individual institutions cover the travel expenses of their participating faculty and administrators. Expenses include fees for workshop and conference consultants, educational materials (e.g., interest tests, career planning exercises), funds for activities of the faculty support groups, and administrative support and evaluation costs. Travel and room and board constitute a major portion of the expenses of this multi-campus program that extends halfway across the country.

For further information contact:

Dr. Steven R. Phillips, director, Associated Schools of the Pacific Northwest, and project director, In Support of Career Planning and Development, University of Puget Sound, Tacoma, Washington 98146

Available materials include:

1. Revised program description: "In Support of Career Planning and Development"—Phases I and II
2. Brochure: "A Workshop on Life and Career Planning for Higher Education."

Gordon College

Wenham, Massachusetts

Gordon College is an independent, Christian college located in Wenham, Massachusetts, a village 25 miles north of Boston. In 1970, the College separated from the Gordon Divinity School and assumed its own identity as a liberal arts college. Gordon employs 55 faculty and enrolls approximately 1,000 students.

Gordon pilot-tested a faculty growth contracting system in 1974. The academic vice president and four tenured full professors participated. In 1976, the College acquired sufficient funding to implement an institution-wide system.

Why was the program initiated?
The rationale behind Gordon's professional growth contracts is explained in the program's handbook. The initiative was stimulated by the reduced level of faculty mobility and turnover in higher education. College personnel recognized that "increasingly, methodological and ideological ferment must be internally generated from relatively stable faculties through development programs. . . . It is essential that colleges and universities continue to experience a climate of expectancy, a sense of movement and vigor that comes from qualitative growth and accomplishment of mission."

The College concluded that its faculty was the most important ingredient in building this institutional ethos. Hence, a program to encourage faculty experimentation and innovation was deemed necessary. The idea was to advance faculty role definition based on individual strengths and interests. This principle encompasses the possibility of fairly radical role change. Thus the growth contracting system has the potential to respond to the diverse needs of individuals (e.g., those desiring a mid-life career transition) and the needs of institutions (e.g., for refocusing faculty expertise in response to changing enrollment patterns).

Gordon's primary objective was "the development of a strong faculty in which diverse gifts complement each other." This objective assumes that institutional development will be a natural byproduct of efforts to stimulate individualized faculty growth.

What are the program's principal elements?
Gordon's program centers around the development of individualized faculty growth plans or contracts. A growth contract consists of a straightforward statement of concrete development goals and a detailed plan for achieving them. Preparation and implementation of a growth contract follows a multi-step, sequential process that covers a period of two to five years. Participation in the program is voluntary and is open to all full-time Gordon College faculty and selected administrators.

A self-assessment is the first phase of the process. Each participant drafts a frank assessment of his or her professional strengths and weaknesses, likes and dislikes, and major responsibilities. The individual also lists roles and responsibilities he or she would like to assume or redefine in the future. A descriptive individual profile results from this effort.

The profile provides a basis for developing an individual plan for growth. A growth plan consists of a statement of personal goals, means for achieving these goals, techniques for assessing the quality of outcomes, and a budget request for funds to support development plans. (The program's handbook stresses the necessity of sufficient funding to support the plans that faculty design.) Specific plans are usually drafted for each year required to achieve an individual's long-range goals.

Growth plans are designed and executed with the assistance of an Advisory Committee of supportive colleagues, the dean of the faculty, divisional chairpersons, and the Faculty Development Committee. These groups help the faculty member devise a realistic strategy and are available to offer assistance during the implementation period. The Advisory Committee and the faculty participant each assess the outcomes of a year's development activities. These assessments are preliminary to revisions in the growth plans for successive years. The planning-implementation-assessment cycle is repeated annually until long-range objectives have been achieved.

Gordon's growth contracting system provides an opportunity for faculty to enhance their strengths and to test out role revisions that may be particularly suited to their abilities and interests. The growth contracting system promotes the degree of institutional flexibility required to permit professional growth within the context of the traditional faculty career. The *Growth Contracts Handbook*, however, stresses two essential prerequisites of a successful program. First, growth contracts must be self-designed and self-imposed; a sense of ownership is vital to the effectiveness of faculty growth plans. Second, a growth contracting system should maximize the potential for reward for successful goal attainment while minimizing the penalty for failure. Thus, faculty must be free to participate without fear that their involvement might negatively influence decisions about tenure or salary. Hence, at Gordon, the program is not connected with the institution's system of faculty evaluation.

What are the program's outcomes?

Theoretically, Gordon's program of growth contracts provides liberal opportunities for role change and career redefinition. For a few faculty, the growth contracting program has been a catalyst for substantial career change. It has stimulated some professors to leave Gordon for new positions in academic administration or full-time research. However, thus far most faculty have designed fairly traditional development projects. A 1976 study found that the largest number of growth activities divided into two categories: instructional development and professional or scholarly development. Much smaller categories included personal development, religious development, student services related development, and miscellaneous development activities. A 1978 report indicated that the distribution of growth projects remained comparable to the 1976 figures. This pattern of faculty activities is probably related to the strength of the professional reward system. The *Growth Contracts Handbook* suggests that "faculty may see their upward mobility being tied to their instructional and scholarly development and, therefore, they focus upon strengths and weaknesses in these two areas."

Evaluative data indicate that the program has been a success in many respects. Each year at least 66 percent of the faculty have voluntarily developed growth plans. For the 1980-81 academic year, 83 percent wrote contracts. Participants generally believe that professional growth has occurred as a result of the program. For example, 79 percent of the participants believed that the program had been important to their development; 92 percent indicated that they had done things they otherwise would not have done; 92 percent concluded that the program was satisfying and should continue.

What are the program's principal costs and funding sources?
Gordon's growth contracting program has a $350,000 budget for six years of operation. Most of this funding covers the cost of individual development plans. Each year the college distributes $48,000 among the plans approved. Average grants range from $650 to $850 depending on the number of program participants in a given year. Money is also available to hire temporary replacements for faculty awarded leave to complete their growth plans. A small portion of the budget also covers part of the project director's salary, a half-time secretary, and office supplies.

Project funding comes from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and the College. Kellogg has provided approximately 36 percent of the program budget, and the College covers the remainder. Kellogg support was available for the first four years of the program. The College has agreed to fund the program entirely for at least two additional years.

For further information contact:
Dr. R. Judson Carlberg, dean of faculty and director of the faculty development program, Gordon College, Wenham, Massachusetts 01984

Available materials include:
Professional Development Through Growth Contracts Handbook

Pennsylvania State Colleges Educational Services Trust Fund
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Fourteen publicly supported higher education institutions compose the Pennsylvania State College system. These colleges serve predominantly undergraduate student bodies but offer some academic programs at the master's degree level. Enrollments range from 2,500 to 12,000 students. Approximately 4,500 faculty teach in the Pennsylvania State Colleges. Most of the colleges are located in relatively small cities and towns separated from major urban centers.

Why was the project initiated?

Due to uncertain financial conditions in the late 1970s, institutions in the system faced the possibility of retrenchment and the loss of many faculty positions. The Pennsylvania State College Career Development Clearinghouse was established in 1978 as a service to faculty whose careers were threatened by precarious financial circumstances. Initially, the objective was to prepare faculty for nonacademic employment. Workshops offered by the Clearinghouse would concentrate on the job search skills needed to locate work outside of higher education.

Pennsylvania's original program, however, evolved with changing conditions. The expected retrenchment did not occur, but the fear of financial and faculty cutbacks later in the 1980s and 1990s persisted. Concern for the morale and productivity of all faculty led to the design of a broader based response. Project Director Donald Drake described the motivation for this revision: "From an institutional point of view, the well-being of the campuses will depend upon those who stay more than upon those who leave for whatever reason." Hence, a workshop program was designed to serve equally well faculty who wish to change careers and faculty who want to renew their careers within higher education. Accordingly, the Clearinghouse was renamed the Career Renewal Project.

What are the project's principal elements?

The Career Renewal Project consisted of two principal elements—on-campus career development resources and a workshop series. Each campus in the system had a collection of career renewal resources. These included a small library of career development literature, a career renewal training module complete with a video cassette, and a faculty resource person who could discuss the career renewal process.

The second component of the project was a series of three sequential one and a half day workshops. The first two workshops were mandatory for project participants, the third optional. The initial workshop consisted of a "life exam" in which participants employed a variety of exercises to examine their life values and goals, stress levels, learning styles, and supportive networks. This workshop also covered adult development theory "for the light it sheds upon individual changes, both past and anticipated" (Drake 1980).

The second workshop came two weeks after the first. The interval permitted some reflection and action on the ideas and plans generated during the "life exam." Career renewal was the focus of the second workshop. Participants compared their work values and interests with the values reinforced by their current employment. They also identified their generic skills that could be useful in other employment settings and "brainstormed" about possible career options. At the end of this workshop each participant drafted a contract to do something positive about his or her career.

Workshop three was designed specifically for faculty who had decided to pursue non-academic employment. Based on the life and career goals defined in the two previous sessions, this workshop focused on methods to achieve those goals outside of a college or university. Faculty learned how to transform their curriculum vita into a functional brief. They researched occupations that interested them and established job-search networks. Ideally, participation in this workshop resulted in "the tools and confidence to plan an effective career change strategy. . ." (Drake, 1980).

In June 1980, the Career Renewal Project sponsored a special conference on career options. The purpose of this conference was to bring professors in contact with former academics who now work in other settings. Conference presenters discussed career opportunities in business and government, as well as self-employment. The conference permitted participants to explore the personal aspects of a career transition along with the mechanics of a move out of higher education. The Career Options Conference served as an extension of the career renewal workshops. It was not, however, a substitute for the more intensive and individually focused workshop sequence.

What are the project's outcomes?

Forty-five Pennsylvania State College faculty took advantage of the career renewal workshops. These participants represented a wide spectrum of the total faculty population. Their ages ranged from 30 to 60. Years of service on their campuses varied from 1 to 20. However, the average age of 41 and average length of service of 11 years suggest that the Career Renewal Project particularly appealed to mid-career faculty.

A formal evaluation one year after the workshops revealed that faculty participants had continued the career renewal process and had made important changes. Some had taken leaves, some had changed careers, some had developed new research interests, some had altered their personal lives.

There was overwhelming agreement that the workshops were very worthwhile. Participants also concluded that other faculty on their campuses could benefit from the workshop series.

Twelve of the original participants have trained to lead subsequent career renewal workshops for their colleagues in the system. Funding problems, however, have closed the Educational Services Trust Fund, the Career Renewal Project's sponsoring agency. At present, the Project's future is in doubt.

What are the project's costs and funding sources?
A grant of $56,000 per year from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education supported the Career Renewal Project for two years. Expenses included the project director's salary, secretarial help, consultants' fees, travel money, resource materials and supplies, and rent on a central resource center. Individual institutions absorbed some of the project's indirect expenses such as faculty time to attend workshops and training sessions, meeting space for the workshops, and some administrative responsibilities.

For further information contact:
(Former director), Mr. Donald Drake, Division of Continuing Education, Hasbrauck Building, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003; or Ms. Anne R. Edwards, assistant director, Career Planning and Placement, Clarion State College, Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214.

Available materials include:
1. *PROD*, Winter 1980: a newsletter dedicated to faculty professional development for the Pennsylvania State Colleges and University.
2. Report to the Board of State Colleges and University Presidents (September 6, 1979), by Donald E. Drake, director, Career Renewal Project.

Career Planning Projects

	CASC and Associated Schools of Pacific Northwest	Gordon College	Pennsylvania State Colleges
Main objective	Support personal and career development of pre-tenure, mid-career, and pre-retirement faculty	Maintain intellectual ferment among a stable faculty	Promote career renewal within higher education or transition to other career opportunities
Services	Workshops on career planning; follow-up workshops on specific needs; career transition support groups	Individualized growth contracting system; peer support committee; financial assistance to implement growth plans	Career library and resource person on campus; career planning workshop series; workshop on career transition techniques
Participation	Open to all faculty	Open to all faculty	Open to all faculty in 14-college system
Administration	Administered through consortium office	Administered through office of dean of the faculty	Administered through a central office
Funding	Grant from Northwest Area Foundation; institutions support travel of their participants	Grant from Kellogg Foundation plus institutional funds	Grant from FIPSE; institutions absorbed some indirect expenses
Duration	2 years	6 years of foundation support; continuing on local funds	2 years

Respecialization/Retraining Projects

Faculty can also broaden their career paths by expanding their fields of expertise or training for a different type of work. Institutions in several regions of the country assist professors who wish to branch out professionally. Retraining programs usually serve two primary purposes: They encourage professional renewal by enabling faculty to develop new skills and expertise, and they permit efficient use of an institution's resources by moving under-utilized faculty to areas of greater need. Respecialization programs can help an institution avoid faculty layoffs and reduce the number of part-time faculty it must hire to fill special needs. As the following case studies show, faculty retraining is an option for small colleges as well as for major university systems.

California State University, Long Beach
Long Beach, California

The Center for Faculty Development at California State University, Long Beach has fostered improved teaching and learning since its inception in 1971. The Center provides a variety of instructional development services and sponsors career planning workshops. In 1978, Chancellor Glenn Dumke responded to the recommendations of the Task Force on Innovation and approved a grant to establish a faculty retraining component at the Center.

Why was the program initiated?
The retraining component was created to benefit individual faculty members and the institution as a whole. Declining enrollment in some departments with high tenure ratios and expanding enrollment in others generated interest in a program to retrain faculty. One objective was to replace part-time instructors with full-time faculty from over-staffed departments. However, as project evaluator Eugene Rice concludes, the retraining component was more than a simple retrenchment strategy. The primary goal was to "strengthen the link between the institutional needs for a quality academic program and the faculty needs for opportunities for broadening their areas of teaching competence." (Whitcomb and Dinielli 1979).

What are the program's principal elements?
Long Beach initiated formal projects to retrain faculty in three teaching areas: English composition and technical writing; American studies; and religious studies. In addition, a small number of

faculty pursued their own retraining programs by means of directed study. Participants came from a variety of humanities and social science disciplines.

The formal retraining programs employed a mixture of seminars, writing, class observation and participation, text examination, and course design to prepare faculty for new teaching assignments. Each of the three structured programs used different combinations of these training methods. However, the programs were all one semester in duration and gave faculty one-fourth released time for that term. Following the period of instruction, faculty participants were evaluated in order to certify them to teach in their new fields.

Professors pursuing directed study worked under the guidance of a faculty member from the host (or receiving) department. Rice states that this close association "provides the retrainee with an entree into the host department that reaches beyond the subject matter learned. Having a sponsor who is acquainted with the quality of one's work provides the kind of necessary legitimation that is totally lacking in a straight reassignment procedure."

What are the program's outcomes?

Twenty-five Long Beach faculty participated in the retraining project during 1978-79. Of these, 16 were certified as acceptable by the receiving departments. During the spring and fall 1979 semesters, 15 class sections were taught by these retrained professors.

Benefits of the program extended beyond the specific expertise acquired by the participating faculty. The program enabled the university to replace part-time teachers with under-utilized full-time teachers. The project has encouraged several faculty to engage in conscious career planning and some have initiated plans to make career changes or retire early. Perhaps the most positive outcome is the sense of vitality and renewal that the project has stimulated. The assessment of one retrained faculty member is fairly representative: "My professional life has been enriched by my participation in the English Retraining Seminar . . . After 11 years as a faculty member, I can say that the technical writing training . . . has been my most positive faculty experience."

Several important characteristics of faculty retraining programs become apparent from the Long Beach experience:

- Faculty participation should be completely voluntary.
- The faculty retraining process should be tied directly to academic program assessment and planning. In this way, individual and institutional objectives can complement each other.
- The support of academic leaders is essential.
- Strong, flexible faculty can best make the transition to a new teaching field.

- Released time for retraining improves the quality of the outcome.
- Participation in retraining should be recognized in salary, promotion, and tenure decisions.

What are the program's costs and funding sources?
Temporary replacement for faculty participants accounted for the major expenses of the faculty retraining component. Part-time faculty were hired to cover the classes of the instructors on one-fourth released time. The cost of the program during 1978-79 was covered by grants from the system-wide Chancellor's Office and from regular institutional funds.

For further information contact:
Dr. David Whitcomb, director, Center for Faculty Development, California State University, Long Beach, 1250 Bellflower Boulevard, Long Beach, California 90840

Available materials include:
"Developing the Faculty Retraining Component of Faculty Development," Final Report, September 1, 1979.

The College of Saint Scholastica
Duluth, Minnesota

The College of Saint Scholastica is a four-year liberal arts institution related to the Roman Catholic Church. The College enrolls about 1,000 full-time students and employs approximately 80 faculty. Saint Scholastica has actively supported faculty development through special funds administered by a Faculty Welfare Committee. The faculty respecialization project is part of the Northwest Area Foundation's grant program to support faculty vitality.

Why was the program initiated?
The College's faculty respecialization project was stimulated by a sooner-than-expected drop in enrollment. This development initiated "serious and constructive thinking about maintaining the vitality of faculty in a period of retrenchment and enrollment decline" (Proposal prepared for the Northwest Area Foundation). Likewise, financial considerations made it imperative to make full use of current faculty and reduce the number of part-time teachers hired to meet special educational needs.

Each of the College's academic units was charged with the task of developing long-range plans to cope with any further enrollment declines. Based on its analysis of the future, Saint Scholastica proposed several initiatives to maintain institutional vigor. One strategy is to help underutilized faculty (those with small class enrollments) develop expertise to teach in new or related subject areas. Respecialization is a way to foster professional growth and renewal, as well as a means to reduce the College's dependence on part-time faculty.

What are the program's principal elements?

Five members of the Saint Scholastica faculty are currently preparing to teach in related fields of their original disciplines or subfields. An assistant professor of French is taking more work in Spanish; an associate professor of history is taking additional graduate work in political science; an instructor in media arts technology is preparing to teach media arts theory; an instructor of music is pursuing the qualifications to teach basic speech; a health administration instructor is taking courses to prepare her to teach computer science. Generally, the faculty retraining activities consist of individual coursework over successive summers. There are no planned common experiences such as seminars on new teaching methods or career planning workshops.

An evaluation of the program's first phase emphasizes that participants are not delving into completely new fields. The evaluator comments that "all five faculty members had done some previous work or had experience in their area of respecialization; there was no launching out into the unknown." Each of the five participants indicates that they have friends or colleagues available for consultation and support during the retraining process, however only two have persons who could qualify as professional helpers.

The program has two primary goals:

1. By the end of summer 1982, at least four faculty will be qualified to teach at least two courses in a new or related field.
2. By 1982-83, four part-time faculty will have been replaced by currently employed faculty fully qualified to teach the former's courses.

What are the program's outcomes?

Saint Scholastica's respecialization program is in progress, so it is not possible to report on lasting effects. Four of the five participants began their study in 1979. Several of these faculty have already offered courses in their new areas of specialization. These instructors also report indirect benefits from their coursework, such as the opportunity to observe other teaching techniques and increased self-confidence.

The initial evaluation report notes several pertinent issues that should be addressed as a respecialization program such as Saint Scholastica's proceeds. Among these are:

1. The increased workload which respecialized staff often encounter.
2. What happens if the retrained instructor is needed in his or her original field?
3. What happens when a professor's personal goals and career development objectives do not "mesh with institutional needs?"

What are the program's costs and funding sources?
Saint Scholastica encourages faculty respecialization by covering most retraining costs. The five participants receive a summer salary and fringe benefits while they take courses. The College also pays for tuition expenses, supplies, and travel to the universities where faculty study. The bulk of these costs are covered by a three-year Northwest Area Foundation Grant.

For further information contact:
Sister Mary Odile Cahoon, vice president and academic dean, College of Saint Scholastica, 1200 Kenwood Avenue, Duluth, Minnesota 55811

Available materials include:
Proposal to the Northwest Area Foundation.

Mary College
Bismarck, North Dakota

Mary College seeks to provide liberal arts preparation as the basis for later professional work. It offers both associate and bachelor's degrees, enrolls approximately 800 students, and employs about 60 faculty. To respond to regional needs, and to attract additional students, the College is in the process of implementing "areas of emphasis" in health care, social service, management, and energy. Faculty of the College are currently acquiring additional training to teach in these new areas.

Why was the program initiated?
Mary College initiated a retraining program in order "to maintain current faculty through more efficient utilization of existing staff" (proposal to the Northwest Area Foundation). The main purpose of the program is to retrain underutilized professors to fill particular

needs at the school. A secondary objective is to equip faculty participants with additional skills that would enhance their employability elsewhere should the College need to eliminate positions.

What are the program's principal elements?
For two years the College conducted faculty load/production analyses as a means of identifying underutilized faculty. These individuals, mostly from the liberal arts, are retraining to serve new teaching and staff roles. Ten faculty will teach in the professionally oriented "areas of emphasis." Six will serve in non-teaching capacities, including career counseling, basic skill development, and support services for adult learners. Two faculty will teach in other areas so that some positions can be consolidated.

Re-education plans necessarily vary according to individual objectives. Plans involve appropriate combinations of "graduate course work, participation in workshops and institutes, internships, self-directed student and tutorial experiences" (Proposal to the Northwest Area Foundation).

Most retraining activity occurs during the summer months. Some retraining also goes on during the academic year. This is especially true for faculty preparing for service in non-instructional roles. Faculty may negotiate a reduced teaching load while they are engaged in retraining activities.

What are the program's outcomes?
The two-year retraining program ends April 30, 1981. An outside evaluation will be conducted to assess project results.

What are the program's costs and funding sources?
Program expenses include salary for the director, tuition, travel, living expenses while retraining faculty attend classes and workshops. The project will also provide stipends for faculty who take internships. The Northwest Area Foundation awarded Mary College a two-year grant to cover costs of the retraining project.

For further information contact:
Dr. Thomas P. Johnson, vice president for academic affairs, Mary College, Apple Creek Road, Bismarck, North Dakota 58501

Available materials include:
Proposal to the Northwest Area Foundation.

University of Wisconsin System
Madison, Wisconsin

The University of Wisconsin System consists of 13 universities and 14 university centers located throughout the state. The System office in Madison coordinates policy development and disseminates funds appropriated by the state government. In the area of faculty development, System Administration sets general guidelines for program design. The System stimulates professional development activities on individual campuses by providing matching funds for various types of program initiatives. In addition to traditional sabbaticals and faculty renewal projects, the System encourages faculty retraining, exchange, and relocation.

Why was the program initiated?
Wisconsin's retraining and relocation policies have evolved since they were first conceived in 1973-74. During that period, many tenured and non-tenured faculty were notified that they would be laid-off or released due to serious financial restrictions. "Recognizing that the faculty are our most valuable resource," Academic Planner Steven Karges says, "the System launched a three-pronged program of reassignment, relocation, and retraining in order to avert as many actual layoffs as possible."

Since the original crisis, faculty retraining has become "a key portion of the System's total program for faculty development and renewal," Karges observes. Temporary faculty exchanges and permanent relocation of professors to different U-W campuses also continue as career development options for academic personnel. A 1975 academic planning statement describes the principal purpose of Wisconsin's retraining and relocation policies as "to foster intellectual vitality among faculty, ensure excellence in academic programs, and to increase flexibility of response to changing academic program needs and shifting student preferences within the constraints of a relatively fixed resource base."

What are the program's principal elements?
The Wisconsin System supports professional development in a variety of ways. This report focuses on faculty opportunities for retraining, exchange, and relocation. Of these three, faculty currently use the retraining option most frequently. The System has general guidelines for the implementation of faculty retraining policies. Within this framework, each institution develops its own program. Usually faculty retrain in fields of study closely allied to their original area of specialization. Retraining projects may be individualized or group efforts. Group workshops continue for one

to three weeks; individual retraining projects usually take one or two semesters.

All retraining proposals must be approved at both the institution and system levels. Projects should be consistent with the faculty development goals of the individual institution involved and tenured faculty normally receive priority over probationary faculty for System funds. Authorized retraining projects are eligible for matching funds from the local institution and the System faculty development account. Retraining proposals may request funds for salary support, tuition and fees, costs of professional workshops, seminars or institutes, travel funds, and living expenses. Naturally, funding requests must be reasonable and in line with the scope of the retraining project. Faculty are urged to take courses within the University of Wisconsin System where tuition remission can be arranged.

Retraining projects must lead to a definite faculty placement. Approval of a retraining plan is dependent on a need for the skills and expertise to be developed and the availability of a position for the retrained faculty member to fill upon completion of the retraining effort.

Faculty exchange and relocation are additional procedures Wisconsin employs to encourage institutional flexibility and maximum use of faculty skills. Institutions within the System may negotiate short-term appointments for faculty members from other U-W campuses. The System also facilitates intra-system faculty transfers between departments and institutions. Appropriate administrative arrangements must be negotiated among the affected institutions, departments, and individuals. In the case of faculty transfer, issues of status, promotion, and tenure must be worked out between the faculty member and his or her new department and institution.

What are the program's outcomes?

The fortunes of Wisconsin's faculty retraining program have fluctuated with the degree of institutional and System Administration support. However, since 1978 the number of funded retraining projects has increased annually. In 1980-81, 58 retraining projects involving 538 people received support. Presently, we have no data on the outcomes of faculty exchanges and transfers.

What are the program's costs and funding sources?

Salaries for retraining faculty are the major cost of the Wisconsin program. Tuition remission arrangements keep tuition costs minimal. Some expenses are incurred for workshop and seminar fees, books, supplies, travel, and living expenses. Faculty exchanges and transfers generate few expenses above normal institutional operating costs. Program costs are shared equally by the individual institutions and the Wisconsin system.

For further information contact:
Dr. Steven Karges, academic planner, University of Wisconsin System, 1664 Van Hise Hall, 1220 Linden Drive, Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Available materials include:
1. *General U.W. System Guidelines for Faculty Renewal and Retraining Projects.*
2. *Faculty Development and Renewal: A System Policy for Faculty Transfer and Exchange.*

Respecialization/Retraining Projects

	California State, Long Beach	College of St. Scholastica	Mary College	University of Wisconsin System
Main objective	Prepare faculty in areas with declining enrollment to teach in growing fields; replace part-time instructors with current full-time faculty	Utilize current faculty fully and reduce the number of part-time teachers hired to meet special needs	Qualify faculty for nonteaching roles or to teach in college's new program areas of emphasis; maintain current faculty and expand their employability elsewhere	Foster intellectual vitality and increase flexibility of response to changing educational needs within confines of a fixed resource base
Services	On-campus program of seminars, writing, course design; directed study under guidance of faculty from receiving department	Financial support for course work over successive summers to prepare faculty to teach in related fields	Individually designed; includes support for graduate course work, participation in workshops and institutes, independent study	Financial support for individualized retraining; retraining workshops for faculty groups
Participation	25 during 1978-79	5 initially	15 initially	58 retraining projects during 1980-81 involving 538 faculty
Administration	Administered through Center for Faculty Development	Administered through office of academic dean	Administered through office of academic vice president	Each institution's retraining projects must be approved by System Administration
Funding	Grant from the system chancellor	Grant from Northwest Area Foundation	Grant from Northwest Area Foundation	Matching funds from local institution and system faculty development account

Respecialization/Retraining Projects, cont.

	California State, Long Beach	College of St. Scholastica	Mary College	University of Wisconsin System
Duration	Initial effort, 1 year	3 years	2 years	In operation since 1973-74
Additional information	Faculty received ¼ released time to participate in the program; project paid for temporary faculty replacements	———	Some released time possible during retraining	Faculty urged to take courses within the Wisconsin System; approval of a retraining project depends on projected need for skills to be developed and availability of definite placement

000 37

Experiential Projects: Internships and Exchanges

Off-campus internships and faculty exchanges are additional mechanisms to increase faculty career alternatives. Placement in related non-academic settings permits them to view their discipline from a different perspective, to acquire new knowledge, and develop skills that can be useful upon returning to the classroom. Internships also provide opportunities to test out career alternatives without severing ties with the current profession. Similarly, exchange opportunities enabling faculty to teach at different institutions or in different fields also serve to broaden their experience, the range of resources they have to offer an institution, and hence, their employability.

Many colleges and universities have recognized for quite some time that students can benefit from experiential learning situations. The following four institutions have applied the same principle to encourage their faculty to grow professionally.

Birmingham-Southern College
Birmingham, Alabama

Birmingham-Southern College is affiliated with the Methodist Church and enrolls approximately 1,300 students. The College's approach to undergraduate education is innovative, offering a liberal arts education but at the same time helping students prepare for a profession or vocation. Students have a variety of formal and informal opportunities to interact with the work world, and this vocational orientation has a significant impact on faculty responsibilities and their own career development.

Why was the program initiated?

A formal program linking education with the employment sector began in 1977. Project Work-Learn recognized that "the total development of the student is narrowed when the world of education and the world of work are isolated from each other." To compensate for this common educational deficiency, Birmingham-Southern determined to build bridges between education and work. The theory behind this initiative assumed that better partnerships between the College and the community would lead to "richer, more extensive learning."

The project had two fundamental objectives:

1. Birmingham-Southern faculty and staff and local business, labor, professional, and governmental executives would increase their mutual understanding and mutual assistance.
2. Birmingham-Southern students and local business, labor, professional, and governmental employees would increase their use of each other's resources.

What are the program's principal elements?
Project Work-Learn was guided by an advisory board composed of educators, business persons, members of the clergy, public servants, and civic leaders. The project employed eight different programs to stimulate greater interaction between the College and the working world. Several of these programs directly expanded the professional lives of Birmingham-Southern's faculty:

1. Visiting Professors Program. This program enabled faculty to work for one month in a non-academic setting. It provided an opportunity for professors to diversify personally and professionally, to enrich their classroom teaching, to identify out-of-class learning possibilities for students, to help the host agency fulfill certain needs, and to uncover areas for future collaboration in the community. These short-term internships ranged from editing descriptive materials at city hall to developing a training program for nuclear reactor employees.
2. Executives-in-Residence Program. This complement to the Visiting Professors Program brought executives from business, labor, and government to campus for two weeks. The executives had considerable freedom to pursue their own professional development interests. They attended whatever classes interested them and participated in a seminar on "Work, Education, and the Quality of Life." Each visiting executive worked with a faculty partner during this "mini-sabbatical." This close cooperation added a new dimension to the professor's career. One of the objectives of the Executives-in-Residence Program was to identify areas where Birmingham-Southern and the non-academic sector could continue to work cooperatively. Hence, ongoing faculty professional activity beyond campus boundaries was an indirect objective of the Executives-in-Residence Program.
3. Education-Work Retreats. These retreats brought together faculty and staff of the college with personnel from other sectors of the community. The purpose was "to identify areas of interest to both parties" and "to promote mutual understanding and mutual assistance."
4. Career Consultants. This program identified persons in business, industry, labor, government, and religious organizations

willing to offer career development assistance to Birmingham-Southern students. Career consultants volunteered to speak with student groups, meet with students at their place of work, and supervise student internships. Faculty expanded their traditional teaching roles by helping students develop learning contracts for their internship experiences and by supervising and evaluating students' out-of-class learning experiences.

5. Lunch-N-Learn. Birmingham-Southern faculty led lunchtime discussions at various business locations. Some of the discussion topics were work-related, others were simply of mutual interest; they covered a range from environmental action to Queen Victoria. This program represented another effort to forge a constructive partnership between the college community and the working world.

What are the program's outcomes?

The final report on Project Work-Learn documents a high level of faculty involvement in the project's various activities. Twenty-seven faculty went off campus as visiting professors. Faculty have worked in partnership with 48 executives-in-residence. During the project's first two years, 61 professors (89 percent of the faculty) helped students design "out-of-class learning contracts," and nine professors led workplace discussions in the Lunch-N-Learn program. In addition, numerous faculty participated in other project activities, such as the education-work retreats.

Both faculty and non-academic participants generally gave positive assessments of the various project elements. Several faculty who participated in the Visiting Professors Program concluded that the experience would benefit their teaching by heightening their awareness of the relationship between education and work. Large percentages of faculty and executives reported that the Executives-in-Residence Program had a positive impact on their personal and professional development.

W. Edmund Moomaw, academic vice president, concludes that Project Work-Learn has benefited faculty in two ways. First, faculty have developed an appreciation of the range of learning resources available in the community. Second, faculty have developed a better idea of what they need to teach in order for their students to be successful participants in the community following graduation. Perhaps the most lasting achievement of the Work-Learn project is the realization that: "the worlds of work and education can come together and exchange ideas, knowledge, and values, as well as provide mutual assistance to one another." As the 1979 progress report states, "the program has built bridges between the community and the college that will lend themselves to follow-up at a later date." An increased level of interaction and cooperation between Birmingham-Southern and its neighbor organizations offers a greater variety of professional opportunities for the College's faculty and promises to stimulate continued faculty vitality.

The formal Work-Learn project ended in 1980 with the termination of outside funding. Several elements of the project are continuing, however, under various divisions of the College. The Visiting Professors Program remains as a professional development option, although with a less formal structure and with faculty responsible for arranging their own internship experience. The Executives-in-Residence Program and the Education-Work Retreats continue in essentially their original form. The Lunch-N-Learn program is evolving into a faculty speakers bureau offering its services to all sectors of the community.

What are the program's costs and funding sources?

A project director and secretary were employed to administer the project. Additional expenses included consultant fees, travel costs, instructional costs for various seminars, and stipends for the executives-in-residence and faculty participants in the Visiting Professors Program.

The Kellogg Foundation provided approximately $250,000 of support over a three-year period. Birmingham-Southern contributed an additional one-third of that sum to the project. Some of the costs of the original program have been pared as various activities have been institutionalized. For example, faculty visitors and executives-in-residence no longer receive a stipend for their participation.

For further information contact:

Dr. W. Edmund Moomaw, vice president for academic affairs, Birmingham-Southern College, 800 8th Avenue West, Birmingham, Alabama 35204

Educational Ventures, Inc.
Cedar Crest and Muhlenberg Colleges
Allentown, Pennsylvania

Cedar Crest and Muhlenberg Colleges are both small, church-related institutions located in eastern Pennsylvania. Cedar Crest is a women's college; Muhlenberg is coeducational. The colleges have a history of cooperation with each other and with other schools in the Lehigh Valley Association. In 1973, Cedar Crest and Muhlenberg set up a special cooperative experiment called Educational Ventures, Inc. designed to strengthen the institutions academically and financially by permitting them to share resources and offer joint programs.

In an effort to increase students' educational options, the colleges permit students to cross-register for courses not available on their home campus. In addition, Cedar Crest has a well-established program to broaden its students educational experiences through a variety of off-campus internship opportunities.

Why was the program initiated?

Like its student-oriented initiatives, Educational Ventures' faculty internship program was motivated by a desire to prepare professors for the challenges of the future. Short-term placement of faculty in non-academic work settings had three fundamental objectives:

1. The personal development of professors resulting from "working successfully in a non-academic situation" and the sense of renewal resulting from a novel experience.
2. The development of networks between the campuses and external organizations that would benefit both the colleges and the cooperating organizations by sharing talent and facilities and by providing a forum for intellectual growth.
3. The enhancement of teaching, student advising, and curricular innovation by increasing professors' knowledge of employment markets and by opening new avenues for student internships.

What are the program's principal elements?

EVI's faculty internship program was loosely structured and adaptable to the interests and constraints of individual professors. Essentially, the program placed faculty in non-academic working environments for short periods, generally three months to a year. Faculty were expected to fill a responsible working role within an organization so that they could develop insights into various occupations and professions. The program advisors believed that consulting with an agency, observing an organization's operations, or participating in its public relations activities would not provide the degree of insight possible from working on the inside for a substantial period of time.

The program director was responsible for helping interested faculty find a suitable placement. Often this required lengthy lead time to identify appropriate internship possibilities and to negotiate arrangements with the cooperating organizations. EVI's faculty development office provided a stipend for participants during their off-campus internship, which replaced the participant's regular salary. In some cases, placements were arranged on a cost-sharing basis where the accepting organization paid part or all of the stipend.

What are the program's outcomes?
EVI's internship program operated from 1975 to 1977. During that period, 12 faculty members took internships of various durations and scope. Interest was higher than this number indicates, however. Many "new placements" were negotiated but fell through because the outside agency could not meet its obligations. Some faculty interns worked in local or state government, others in agencies as far away as Europe.

Collectively, the program had a positive impact. The final report lists several of these outcomes. Participants mentioned that they had gained confidence in dealing with non-academic organizations and achieved greater understanding of administrative and organizational matters often not fully appreciated by academicians. Their attitudes toward curricular innovations became more liberal and they recognized the need to articulate educational programs with external, potentially employing, agencies. Finally, participants claimed that they experienced a renewal "different from that of the usual research sabbatical." Work in their area of expertise in non-academic settings permitted professors to expand their circle of colleagues and develop valuable new insights.

Former EVI Chancellor Henry Acres states that several former interns were able to incorporate their non-academic learning experiences into their work after they returned to campus. Four former interns left their original teaching positions and moved on to new career opportunities.

In spite of the internship program's overall success, there were difficulties. The final report focuses on three principal problems:

1. Only a small portion of faculty wished to or could participate in the program. Family and financial considerations prevented many faculty from taking advantage of internship opportunities. Also, the persons most interested in an alternative work experience often tended to be dynamic faculty who needed the experience the least.
2. It was difficult to locate meaningful short-term work experiences. Businesses were supportive of the concept of faculty internships, but a recession, hiring freezes, etc. made them reluctant to place faculty in responsible positions.
3. The small pool of eligible professors made it difficult to match faculty talents with potential positions.

Richard Kolbe, EVI faculty development director, concluded that a faculty internship program could best be administered through a central agency broker representing a number of colleges and universities and the cooperating non-academic organizations. EVI's program ended in 1977 with the termination of its outside funding.

What are the program's costs and funding sources?
Primary expenses included faculty stipends, faculty relocation costs, and salary for the program's director. Administrative expenditures after the initial start-up costs decreased in successive years. The program was funded by a major grant from the Lilly Endowment. In addition, Educational Ventures, Inc. and two participating organizations (the City of Allentown and Lehigh County) contributed.

For further information contact:
Dr. Richard L. Kolbe, chairman, Department of Politics and Economics, Cedar Crest College, Allentown, Pennsylvania 18104.

Available materials include:
EVI Annual Report, 1976-77.
Faculty Development—Linking the Campus to the World Beyond, Final Report, 1975-77.

Furman University
Greenville, South Carolina

Located in Greenville, South Carolina, Furman University is a private, liberal arts institution enrolling approximately 2,000 undergraduates. Furman's ongoing concern for faculty careers is reflected by a series of successful professional development programs administered by the Office of Faculty Development. In addition to the Linkages Program described below, Furman recently has had development programs for new and for mid-career professors.

Why was the program initiated?
In recent years, in response to heightened student interest in vocational opportunities, Furman has expanded its career-oriented services. The University considered faculty involvement a key ingredient in the success of its career-related programs. Yet it also recognized that many faculty members, particularly those in the humanities, have little experience or contact outside of academia. Hence, the decision was made to institute a program to "link a liberal arts faculty more effectively with the world their students would face following their college graduation." Furman assumed that close contact with the larger employment sector would enable

faculty to articulate the practical and vocational value of a liberal arts education. Hence, with the assistance of the Association of American Colleges and the National Endowment for the Humanities, Furman instituted Linkages: Humanists in the Working World.

What are the project's principal elements?

The project's design consisted of summer internships in non-academic employment settings for teachers in humanities and social science fields. The six-week experiences were designed to respond to the interests and complement the expertise of each participant. The internships were preceded by a half-day orientation seminar and by a more general workshop on the nature of the work experience.

Six Furman faculty accepted internship positions during the first summer of the program. Some internships were closely related to the faculty member's area of expertise; others provided quite different experiences and employed very different skills. For example, a history professor at the University transferred his analytical skills to the South Carolina Historical Society where he did research in the Society's archives. Similarly, an art professor spent his summer internship helping a Greenville museum prepare educational programs related to a major art acquisition. In contrast, a faculty member who specialized in 18th-century literature took an assignment with the communications office of a local corporation, and a Spanish professor worked with the creative services department of a local television station.

Following their summer non-academic work experiences, the interns contributed to a university careers convocation for students and faculty colleagues. The interns joined with Furman alumni and current students to share their experiences in the "outside world." They also discussed the relationship between humanities education and employment opportunities.

What are the project's outcomes?

Initially, as the final report indicates, faculty interns were rather reluctant to seek a temporary non-academic work experience. Project Coordinator Judith Gatlin states that this was especially true of faculty whose assignment was "relatively removed from their areas of teaching expertise." However, once they committed themselves to an internship opportunity, their experiences turned out to be very positive. Indeed, two of the six interns were offered permanent positions by their employing organizations.

The final project report concludes that the rewards of the initiative were actually greater than anticipated. Participants discovered that their skills were valuable in a non-academic setting. Gatlin concludes that "this awareness has made all six interns more self-confident teachers." Additional beneficial by-products have spun off from the brief internship experiences. Faculty have revised and enriched curricular offerings in their teaching fields and some have identified new publishing possibilities. Perhaps most significant, the participants have established friendships and professionally productive contacts beyond the academic sector. These relationships can benefit students as well as faculty, because they have the potential to keep faculty advisors more in tune with the employment sectors many students will enter following graduation. They also give a professor someone to call for ideas and assistance when a student wants to explore a particular career interest. The fall career convocation that followed the internship program received similar positive evaluations.

Taken as a whole, Linkages: Humanists in the Working World achieved some significant outcomes beneficial to the institution and its students. The program also served to inject some variety into the routine of faculty careers and provided new options for professional growth.

In spite of the project's successes, however, it is also valuable to focus on the problems which it encountered. As mentioned previously, most faculty were reluctant to commit themselves to an alternative vocational experience. Gatlin attributes this to a lingering suspicion of vocationalism. As a result, the coordinator had to proselytize, cajole, and convince faculty to experiment. There also were difficulties in locating agencies willing to take on a temporary intern. Gatlin comments that executives are "fascinated" with the idea of having an academic in residence, however, for various reasons, they eventually "pull back."

Additional problems include the heavy amounts of time required to maintain a successful program and the need for adequate publicity to generate interest in the program. Finally, the ideal length of a non-academic internship remains problematic. Gatlin asserts that a period of more than six weeks is unrealistic in terms of faculty time. She states than an ideological bias precludes use of the academic year for such activity. On the other hand, six weeks may be too short to accomplish much meaningful work.

Due to a variety of complicating forces, especially the economic down-turn, only one internship was arranged for the summer of 1980. The one-year external funding of the program has ended, and the program is now officially over.

What are the program's costs and funding sources?

Major program costs included $2,000 stipends for each faculty intern, speaker fees and other costs of the intern orientation and the two-day on-campus conference, "Humanists in the Working World."

Administrative expenses included support for the project coordinator's salary.

The National Endowment for the Humanities supported linkages with a one-year $28,500 grant. NEH funds were used to cover a large portion of the faculty stipends and the program's administrative expenses. The receiving organizations paid from $200 to $400 of an intern's stipend. A $2,800 grant from the Association of American Colleges covered the costs of the intern orientation program and the convocation on work and humanities that was held after the first series of internships.

For further information contact:
Dr. Judith T. Gatlin, director of career programs, Furman University, Greenville, South Carolina 29613.

Available materials include:
Linkages: Humanists in the Working World, Final Report, February 1980.

The University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

The University of Kansas is a large research university enrolling more than 20,000 undergraduate and graduate students, and employing approximately 1,200 faculty in 11 schools and colleges. The university is located in the northeastern portion of the state, 40 miles from metropolitan Kansas City.

Why was the program initiated?
The Kansas program of intra-university visiting professorships was motivated by a desire to maintain the vitality of the arts and sciences during a period of stable or declining enrollments. As the opportunity to hire new faculty members declines, professors in mid-career will make up larger and larger proportions of the teaching faculty. Academic leaders at Kansas feared that "a situation in which more and more faculty are reworking materials and problems with which they have been wrestling for a number of years will almost certainly have a deadening effect upon the creative vigor of a university" (proposal to the Exxon Education Foundation).

The university saw this situation as an opportunity to take advantage of a little-used, "on-site" source of fresh perspectives on old and new problems: scientists and scholars in other departments, programs, and schools within the university. Theoretically, intra-university visiting professorships would benefit individual faculty and the institution as a whole: A visiting professorship would provide novel intellectual opportunities and a means to expand a faculty member's interests and professional activities; the institution could profit from the development of interdisciplinary courses, movement in new directions within existing disciplines, and the preparation of faculty in subject areas where a new need exists.

The argument for internal visiting professorships is compelling. They could provide many of the benefits commonly expected when professors attend conferences or go to other campuses to do research and take courses. However, the scholarly projects and intellectual excitement generated by on-campus visiting arrangements should be much easier to sustain when faculty remain in close contact with colleagues and resources in the fields they have begun to explore.

What are the program's principal elements?

Kansas' Intra-University Visiting Professorship program is open primarily to faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences who have some 20 or more years of professional experience. Generally, a visiting professor from a given school or department team-teaches in one or two courses in another school or department. In addition, he or she takes courses in that school or department. In exceptional cases, it is possible for a faculty member to team-teach and take courses in a sub-discipline in his or her own department if the arrangement provides an opportunity for the participant to learn different disciplinary methodologies.

Six professorships are awarded annually for the academic year. Under unusual circumstances a visiting professorship might be extended for a second year. Interested faculty submit an application detailing their proposed activities to a screening committee. The screening committee, composed of representatives from the natural sciences, social sciences, humanities, and the professional schools, decides which proposed professorships will be funded. Awards consist of one month's summer salary to permit faculty to prepare for the courses they will be teaching and taking. In addition, participants receive full salary during their visiting professorship.

What are the program's outcomes?

The first six intra-university visiting professors began their work during the summer of 1980. Hence, it is too early to assess outcomes. It appears, however, that the program has generated considerable interest. Thirty-six faculty applied for 12 awards. The diversity of the visiting appointments suggests that faculty interest in innovative professional opportunities is widespread, for example, a math professor to work in model theoretical linguistics, a history professor to study brain processes in the medical school, a philosopher to concentrate on the ethics in the law school, and a psychologist also in the law school, to examine the communication process among jurors.

Eventually, the whole program will be evaluated on its primary and secondary impacts, such as new courses generated, course revisions, interdisciplinary research projects, and related publications produced.

What are the program's costs and funding sources?

Principal costs include salaries for 12 faculty participants (one-month summer support plus nine-month academic year salary), salaries for partial replacement of teaching salaries lost by the home departments of visiting professors, and a small amount of administrative and clerical support. The Exxon Education Foundation funds the summer salary component of the program, while the university absorbs the remaining costs.

For further information contact:

Dr. Sally Yeates Sedelow, associate dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, 206 Strong Hall, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045.

Experiential Projects: Internships and Exchanges

	Birmingham-Southern College	Cedar Crest and Muhlenberg	Furman University	University of Kansas
Main objective	Increase the mutual interaction, understanding, and assistance of college and nonacademic work world	Enhance faculty skills vitalize and encourage greater interaction of the campus and its external environment	Link a liberal arts faculty with the employment sector their students would encounter after graduation	Renew institution by providing novel intellectual opportunities for faculty and preparing them in subject areas where new need exists
Services	One-month faculty internships in nonacademic settings; education-work retreats to identify mutual interest areas of faculty and business persons	Placements in nonacademic work settings (3-12 months) relevant to faculty interests and professional objectives	Summer internships in nonacademic settings relevant to faculty interests and development objectives	Visiting faculty team-teaches and takes courses in another department or school at UK where the participant can learn new scholarly methodologies
Participation	Open to all faculty	Open to all faculty	Open to all faculty	Open primarily to faculty in College of Arts and Sciences with 20 years experience
Administration	Administered by project director	Administered by a consortium serving the two colleges	Administered by director of career programs	Administered by associate dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Funding	Kellogg Foundation and institutional funds	Grants from the Lilly Endowment and participating organizations leges, and the receiving organizations	National Endowment for the Humanities, Association of American Colleges	Exxon Education Foundation and university

Experiential Projects: Internships and Exchanges, cont.

	Birmingham-Southern College	Cedar Crest and Muhlenberg	Furman University	University of Kansas
Duration	3 years; some aspects still in operation	2 years	1 year	Initial program grant for 2 years; will continue thereafter
Additional Information	————	Program was loosely structured to accommodate the interests and constraints of individual faculty	Included a short orientation program and a workshop on the nature of the work experience	Participants receive one month's summer salary to prepare for visiting professorship plus full salary during leave from assignment

Multidimensional/Comprehensive Career Services

Most theorists agree that career development is a complex process, influenced by numerous factors. Thus it is probably safe to assume that a variety of opportunities and services most effectively supports the professional growth of faculty from diverse backgrounds and circumstances.

Some colleges and universities offer several avenues for faculty to diversify their careers. In a few institutions, faculty may choose from discrete services and projects, such as career change workshops and retraining grants, that approach career renewal in different ways. A small number offer more comprehensive programs to help faculty expand their career options. These programs assume that maximum career renewal requires an orderly sequence of activities. This cycle often includes assessment (of values, skills, goals), career decision making, planning the strategy to achieve career objectives, additional training, experimentation, and finally, the actual transition to the new career opportunity.

Our investigation yielded five programs that could be described as multi-dimensional or comprehensive. The five represent small colleges, large private and public universities, and multi-campus consortia. Hence, the following case studies should provide useful models for most higher education sectors.

Concordia College
Moorhead, Minnesota

Located in west-central Minnesota, Concordia College is a private, liberal arts institution affiliated with the American Lutheran Church. Approximately 2,500 students attend Concordia full-time and full-time faculty number 148. The College is located in the small city of Moorhead, in close proximity to Moorhead State and North Dakota State Universities, with which it shares facilities and permits its students to cross-register.

The College has had an active, multi-dimensional professional development program "directed toward the development of individual faculty as professionals in a discipline and as effective teachers of that discipline" (Faculty Development Within the Context of Long-Range Planning 1979). This rather traditional program evolved during a period of rapid institutional growth.

Why was the program initiated?
Projected decreases in the available student pool, changing student educational interests, and the restricted opportunity to hire new instructors suggested that alternative approaches to faculty development might be necessary to maintain institutional vitality during the 1980s. The College has 20 years of experience with long-range institutional planning. The changing circumstances of the new decade made it imperative to strengthen the link between long-range planning objectives and the professional growth opportunities available to faculty.

What are the program's principal elements?
With funds from the Northwest Area Foundation, Concordia has initiated several projects and services with the potential to increase faculty career options. This report focuses on three aspects of the Faculty Development Within the Context of Long-Range Planning program:

1. A Grants Application Model of Professional Growth and Development. The college has a competitive grants program that funds both individual and departmental growth projects. In addition to traditional instructional development plans, the grants program funds retraining activities aimed at achieving maximum utilization of instructional personnel. Funds may also be committed to faculty exchanges with other institutions. Finally, the grants program will support the career exploration and retraining activities of faculty who choose to leave the college for other career opportunities.
2. Analysis and Development of Personnel Policies. Concordia conducted a review of its personnel policies to assess their impact on faculty vitality and mobility. Based on this evaluation, the College planned to draft policies that would increase the career alternatives available to faculty as well as protect the college's ability to adapt to changing conditions.
3. Workshops on Retirement Options and Mid-career Change Opportunities. These programs are intended to acquaint Concordia faculty with alternatives outside of the college setting and to help prepare interested professors for a career transition to the non-academic world. The pre-retirement planning workshop explains federal and state retirement legislation and TIAA-CREF benefits and options. The program also addresses the social and psychological adjustments necessitated by retirement. Plans for the mid-career change workshops call for testing and counseling sessions. In addition, participants will explore alternative career possibilities.

What are the program's outcomes?

Concordia's three-year program to enhance faculty vitality is now in its second year, so definitive outcomes are not yet measurable. Nevertheless, positive trends are apparent. The competitive grants program has generated considerable interest, and more than 30 individual projects and seven departmental projects have been funded. Academic Vice President David Gring, reports that 60 to 70 faculty have been directly affected by this professional growth opportunity.

Three grants have been awarded specifically to prepare faculty for career transitions. These individuals are studying, respectively, business accounting, computer science, and marketing, and plan to leave the college eventually for other vocational opportunities.

The in-depth review of personnel policies has resulted in an early retirement proposal now moving through the college's governance system. The College also may adopt a policy permitting phased or gradual retirement.

The pre-retirement planning workshop was conducted in summer of 1980 and 1981, and the mid-career change workshop in summer of 1981.

What are the program's costs and funding sources?

Support for the grant competition projects constitutes the largest expense for the three programs. Other costs include, stipends for faculty attending workshops and some compensation for workshop leaders. Because clerical and administrative support have been absorbed by incumbent college personnel, no external program funds have been diverted for overhead. To paraphrase Gring, "When we get a grant, it means we just work harder." Concordia's faculty development program is supported by the Northwest Area Foundation with additional resources coming from the College.

For additional information contact:

Dr. David Gring, vice president for academic affairs, Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota 56560

Available materials include:

Faculty Development Within the Context of Long-Range Planning (proposal to the Northwest Area Foundation).

Illinois State University

Normal Illinois

Illinois State University, located in central Illinois, has some 20,000 students and 1,300 faculty. It has a decade-long tradition of formal support for faculty development: The small Faculty Development Program that began in 1969 has evolved into a comprehensive effort to encourage instructional improvement and professional growth through a Teaching-Learning Center and a Professional Development Center.

Why was the program initiated?
With projected enrollment declines and decreased faculty mobility, academic leaders at Illinois State University realized that future institutional vitality would depend on "internally generated intellectual ferment." In other words, new course and program initiatives would rely heavily on the creativity and expertise of current Illinois State faculty. It became obvious that the institution's future well-being depended upon effective use of available human resources.

What are the program's principal elements?
In 1976 the university opened a Professional Development Center as a vehicle to promote academic career development and renewal. The Center provides individual counseling, vocational information, and career planning assistance for faculty interested in career alternatives. Some faculty use the center for specific purposes such as resume preparation; others, who feel that their careers have reached a plateau, seek more extensive assistance. The Professional Development Center helps these individuals "to consider ways of revitalizing interest in their present job or to consider possible career alternatives." Elmer Van Egmond, center director, describes it as a neutral agency. Because it is not involved in the evaluation of faculty, Van Egmond believes "it is possible to help faculty members accept strong feelings . . . and begin the process of developing career plans."

In 1977 Illinois State extended its career development services by establishing the Educational Leave Program. The leave program was designed to assist faculty whose careers are jeopardized by declining enrollments in their teaching fields. It provides funding for professors who wish to leave the university and prepare for other career opportunities. However, the program also is responsive to the needs of the institution. It enables faculty from overstaffed departments to retrain for teaching in areas where enrollment is growing and special instructional needs must be filled.

Any Illinois State faculty member may apply for educational leave, although tenured faculty receive preference. Applicants work out an educational plan through discussions with their department chairperson and the college dean. The individual's personal career goals as well as the priorities of the institution and specific department form the basis for these conferences. The

Educational Leave Plan details the faculty member's responsibilities and, where appropriate, confirms the institution's commitment to use the instructor's newly developed skills.

The plan provides salary support to release the incumbent faculty member and hire a temporary replacement. The staff of the Professional Development Center also helps professors to locate funding for additional expenses, such as tuition, books, and travel.

Because educational leave is designed to meet the needs of individual professors, its requirements are flexible. Recipients may take full- or part-time leave during the academic year or the summer. They may enroll in formal courses, pursue independent study, or gain experience through internships. Many faculty spend their leaves studying in other ISU departments, while others negotiate no-tuition visiting-scholar arrangements with other institutions.

What are the program's outcomes?

Faculty who have used the Professional Development Center's career consultation services rate the services very positively. So far, the rate of participation has been fairly low. Insufficient information about the Development Center is one explanation for the limited usage. A faculty survey indicated that only 11 percent were aware of the professional career consultation program.

To date, 40 Illinois State faculty have taken advantage of the Educational Leave Program. The program has produced diverse outcomes. Some faculty have developed totally new and different skills and significantly altered their career direction. Others have acquired additional training primarily to contribute to a specific new course or program.

Many individual and institutional benefits have emerged from the Educational Leave Program. Participants listed improved instructional procedures, expanded knowledge in their disciplines, more opportunities to publish, greater leadership responsibilities, and increased consulting opportunities among the results. An internal evaluation, published in 1979, states that 69 percent of the recipients had taught new courses based on the knowledge they acquired while on leave. In all cases, the educational leave proved to be a valuable experience. In a fairly representative comment, one leave recipient concluded, "The leave provided an internal psychological lift and personal gratification, as well as personal expertise and professional growth."

What are the program's costs and funding sources?

A support staff, supplies and resources (particularly career development literature), and salaries for recipients and their temporary replacements constitute the major expenses of Illinois State's faculty career development services. The project was funded initially by a grant from the Kellogg Foundation, but the University took over its support in July 1980.

For further information contact:
Dr. Elmer Van Egmond, director, Professional Development Center, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois 61761

Available materials include:
Academic Innovation: Faculty and Instructional Development at Illinois State University.

Linfield College
McMinnville, Oregon

Linfield College is a small, private undergraduate institution located in northwest Oregon. The College employs approximately 75 full-time faculty and its on-campus enrollment is about 1,100. For several years the College has taken steps to foster faculty vitality and responsiveness. In 1977 a tightened tenure policy went into effect, and the College supports a formal faculty development program that encourages instructional and professional development.

Why was the project initiated?
The expected decline in enrollment and economic conditions during the 1980s threatens to decrease the future career options of Linfield faculty. Fears of lowered faculty morale and an increase in institutional rigidity stimulated a new faculty development initiative in the area of career planning and renewal. College personnel were confident that Linfield faculty would participate in such a program, because "enough faculty development work has been done at Linfield to minimize the normal anxiety associated with opening the career issue." Linfield's career planning project responds to the problems of faculty flexibility and morale. The objectives of the project are:

1. To assist Linfield's faculty members to assess the relationship of their professional careers to their life expectations.
2. To help faculty develop new career priorities and relate these to employment opportunities, and personal and economic realities.
3. To assist faculty to develop strategies for achieving their career goals.

For faculty who choose to make a substantial career change, such as acquiring expertise in another teaching field or pursuing a non-academic career, Linfield has two additional objectives, either:

4. To help them develop competence to teach in additional subject areas that would be beneficial to the College, or
5. To assist faculty to attend appropriate career change workshops and engage in in-depth career planning.

What are the project's principal elements?
The career development program consists of several sequential steps. Initially, all interested faculty are invited to participate in a day-long career planning workshop. Prior to the workshop, participants receive appropriate literature on adult development and career planning and complete a vocational assessment instrument such as the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory. The purpose of the workshop is to help faculty assess their career options and make realistic plans for the future.

Following the planning workshop, the coordinator of faculty development, Frank Bumpus, works individually with professors who are considering career changes. Linfield offers moderate financial support for those who wish to develop expertise in new teaching areas. Preference is given to mid-career faculty over 40 and particularly to faculty who propose to develop competence in academic areas that are under-represented at the College.

Summer study at other institutions is the usual means to obtain these new professional skills, however individuals may propose alternative ways to prepare for new career responsibilities. Project funds may be used for travel, secretarial support, books, and other costs that promote personal and professional development.

Linfield's faculty development program also will assist faculty who wish to make more substantial career changes. Funds are available to send faculty to off-campus career change workshops for continued career exploration.

Linfield uses aspects of the Gordon College Faculty Growth Contracting model to foster career development. Persons who wish to make a career revision select an advisory committee of three faculty colleagues. This group helps the faculty member to design a professional development profile and serves a supportive function while the individual works to achieve new career objectives.

Linfield's Professional Development project has followed four steps:

1. Data gathering—August and September 1979
Current interests and values data collected by taking the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory.
2. Reflection—October 1979
Career Perspectives: Past, Present, Future: A one-day workshop on career development among academics.
3. Designing a plan—Second semester 1979
Participants formulate a professional development profile and a twelve-month plan.
4. Implementation of plan—1980-81
Participants pursue the activities they have selected to enhance their on-going professional development.

What are the project's outcomes?

To date, 35 to 40 of Linfield's faculty have participated in the initial career planning workshop. Of these, 10 have proceeded to design professional development plans. The program has involved another 24 faculty serving on professional development advisory committees.

One year after the project began, Dr. Bumpus observes that the project has generated a sense "that careers are ongoing developmental processes." Many participants now realize that they have more flexibility in their careers than they may have thought. Bumpus concludes that the career development project has "opened options [for faculty] and an awareness of them." Individual career renewal plans vary from designing a new course to developing administrative skills or pursuing job opportunities outside the College.

Dr. Bumpus describes the professional development planning process as crucial to successful development. Project planners determined that it would not be wise simply to distribute money for various professional development activities. Requiring individuals to participate in career assessment and planning promotes a sense of ownership and commitment to the plan. Likewise, when colleagues assist in the design of an individual's professional development plan, they also have a stake in his or her success and tend to be very supportive.

What are the project's costs and funding sources?

Linfield College's professional development project was funded for one year by a grant of $56,000 from the Northwest Area Foundation. Project costs have included salary support for the part-time project coordinators, consultant fees, faculty support costs for off-campus career change workshops and training for respecialization (grants ranging from $500 to $900), as well as supplies and travel.

For further information contact:
Dr. J. Frank Bumpus, associate professor of psychology and coordinator of faculty development, Linfield College, McMinnville, Oregon 97128.

Available materials include:

1. Proposal to the NAF for a "Program to Maintain Institutional Flexibility for the 1980s Through Faculty Development."
2. Memo to the faculty describing the NAF Grant for Faculty Development.
3. Memo to the faculty who took the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory or attended the career planning workshop.

Loyola University
Chicago, Illinois

Loyola University of Chicago is a large, urban institution with 15,000 students in 10 different schools. It employs 675 faculty and an additional 125 administrators and trained staff. Loyola's Career Development Program represents a continuation of the university's support for the personal and professional development of faculty and administrators.

Why was the program initiated?

The program was initiated in response to accumulating factors that "conspire to interfere with the normal career growth of faculty and administrators" (Career Development Program brochure 1978). Loyola recognized that enrollment trends, changing student interests, and limited employment mobility would narrow the academic career for many faculty. Traditional faculty development programs that stress disciplinary growth and instructional development were "not broad enough or deep enough" to respond to current and projected professional needs, observes program director Robert Barry. Vice President Richard Matre states that the primary goal of the Career Development Program is to help Loyola faculty and administrators "involve themselves freely and openly in their own personal and career growth."

What are the program's principal elements?

All full-time Loyola faculty, administrators, trained staff, and their spouses are eligible to participate in the Career Development Program. The program offers both general career development services for all faculty and administrators, and specific services for persons with particular development interests.

General services workshops. A series of voluntary assessment and training workshops forms the core of the services appropriate for all Loyola professionals. Brief workshops on financial management and time management teach specific skills but also raise important questions about the individual's future.

A more extensive, one and a half day workshop on Integrating Personal and Professional Goals helps participants assess their current life and career circumstances and consider future directions. The end product of this workshop is a plan to bring about some improvement in one's life. Participants also map out the management procedures and strategies they must follow to achieve their objectives. Subsequent workshops are held six weeks to three months later to monitor, evaluate, and perhaps to revise the plan conceived at the first workshop. The series of workshops on personal and professional goals serves a dual purpose. It helps Loyola professionals who are considering an exchange or outside placement to prepare for a maximally beneficial experience, and at a more general level, the workshops are beneficial to persons who wish to think seriously and systematically about the relationship of their personal lives and their careers.

Small grants fund. The program's general services also include a small grants program. Loyola professional personnel may apply for grants up to $500 for activities that will benefit their teaching or their career advancement.

Skill development workshops. These optional workshops supplement the initial planning workshop. The Workshop on Skill Assessment helps professionals to identify their generic skills that are transportable to other employment settings. The Resume Writing Workshop translates these skills and the traditional academic curriculum vita into a more business-oriented resume. The Interviewing Workshop prepares individuals to present themselves effectively in job interview situations.

Experimentation with career alternatives. Three options permit Loyola personnel to experiment with career alternatives:

1. The Placement Program helps place faculty and administrators in temporary positions in the business, government, and nonprofit sectors so that they may gain knowledge and experience relevant to their academic career or test the possibility of leaving the academic community to pursue other interests. Participants are paid by the employing organization at their regular Loyola salary.

2. The External Exchange Program provides an alternate experience for people who wish to remain within academia. The Program staff helps arrange an exchange of faculty or administrators between Loyola and another institution. This option can help each institution fill temporary, specific needs as well as provide the exchanged individuals with new learning and different perspectives.

3. The Internal Exchange Program permits Loyola professionals to teach in a different department or work in another office of the university. Internal exchanges are designed to expand a person's skills while permitting him or her to experience firsthand possible new career directions. The Career Development Program helps interested faculty and administrators make the necessary arrangements.

Retraining. Funds are available to assist faculty members who need to fulfill new accrediting requirements. This aspect of the Career Development Program can help faculty who wish to move into different academic areas or must satisfy changed requirements in their own discipline.

Career support groups. To maximize the value of career expansion opportunities, the program encourages the establishment of informal career support groups. Periodically, people involved in placement, exchanges, or retraining get together to share experiences, exchange insights, and plan strategy for continued career development.

What are the program's outcomes?

Loyola's Career Development Program is now in its third year of operation. Approximately 75 people have participated in program workshops each year. Twenty-five percent of the workshop participants have been spouses of Loyola personnel. Six persons took placements in non-academic settings during the program's first year, eight the second year. Typical placements include a political scientist who became director of a continuing education program for lawyers, a communication arts professor who took a position designing communication workshops for a major retail corporation, and a history professor who joined a savings and loan association to write a history of the firm. About half of the individuals placed have chosen to leave the university permanently.

So far there have been two internal faculty exchanges but no external exchanges. Barry explains that internal exchanges are relatively easy to arrange, external exchanges are far more complicated.

Eight faculty have capitalized on Loyola's support for retraining. To date, these have been professors in areas where professional requirements have changed. Essentially the program's retraining provisions have enabled these individuals to expand their professional expertise rather than retrain for a new area.

Barry concludes that the placements and retraining offered through the Career Development Program have had a significant impact on individual careers. He believes, however, that the "offering of 'soft' services for career exploration is the most significant aspect of the program from a long-term perspective." Barry states that most higher education professionals currently are not interested in exploring a career change but will in the future become more interested in assessing seriously their lives and careers. In addition to providing current services, Barry feels that the program lays a foundation—gives "permission for an exploration of one's career."

What are the program's costs and funding sources?

Program expenses include the salaries of the director and his assistant. Fees for consultants, lodging, and meals constitute most of the workshop costs. Other costs include funds for the small grant and retraining components.

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education and Loyola University share the cost of the program. FIPSE's support is on a declining scale from 75 percent during the first year to 25 percent during the third. Barry says that this arrangement "gets the university into the habit" of paying for the project.

For further information contact:

Dr. Robert Barry, director, Career Development Program, Loyola University of Chicago, 6525 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois 60626.

Available materials include:

Introductory brochure: "Loyola University of Chicago Career Development Program"

Rochester Area Colleges, Inc.

Rochester, New York

The Rochester Area Colleges, Inc. (RAC) is a consortium of 18 colleges and universities in the vicinity of Rochester, New York. It includes a mix of large and small, public and private, urban and rural institutions enrolling some 72,000 students and employing about 7,000 faculty. The object of the consortium is to reduce costs and offer a broader range of educational opportunities than any of the single colleges or universities could afford. The member schools share facilities and resources and sponsor joint programs, seminars, and workshops. In addition to the services it provides for member institutions, the consortium tries to respond to the needs of individual faculty members.

Why was the project initiated?

Looking toward the future, the Rochester Area Colleges recognized the implications of probable budgetary constraints and changing enrollment trends. It was conceivable that several hundred faculty might have to be displaced during the next few years. Because several institutions faced the same problem, they concluded that a cooperative response would probably be most effective. Program planners had two primary objectives:

1. To help faculty explore and develop new roles within or outside of higher education.
2. To help member institutions achieve more flexible staffing in order to meet changing teaching and administrative needs.

What are the program's principal elements?

The consortium designed a multi-faceted program called the Faculty Professional Development Project—Career Transitions. Implementation of the project has been gradual, however, due to limited financial resources. Program plans call for two major elements: a series of workshops to help faculty assess their careers and plan future directions, and a career development center to provide individualized services to those faculty who wish to try out new academic roles or prepare for employment alternatives outside of higher education.

The career development center is now in operation. Located at the consortium office in Rochester, it provides a neutral setting for career exploration. The center includes a library of information on career transition techniques, skills assessment, and employment opportunities. It also coordinates career counseling for RAC faculty through two campus-based services: Help with personal and professional reassessment are available through the University of Rochester's adult counseling service; testing and career planning services are offered by the Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT). At both RIT and the State University of New York College at Brockport, RAC faculty can use a computerized career information system called SIGI.

To help faculty who wish to develop new skills, the center has negotiated arrangements so individuals can enroll at reduced cost in graduate programs of some member institutions. Currently, RAC professors may take courses free of charge toward a master of business administration or a master of science degree at two RAC universities.

An internship program for faculty is also coordinated through the career development center. Center staff have identified local businesses, government offices, and public service agencies wishing to sponsor faculty interns and attempt to match faculty interests with organizational needs.

Plans for the Faculty Professional Development Project include several more initiatives to be implemented as time and money permit:

1. A procedure for informing underutilized faculty about academic openings in other consortium institutions. The objective is to capitalize fully on faculty talents through joint appointments.
2. A consultant/facilitator service consisting of professionals from various non-academic organizations to introduce faculty to career possibilities in other employment sectors. These contacts would also establish personal communication networks that could be beneficial in the career transition process.
3. A resource file of successful career changers who could act as consultants or advisors to faculty in transition.
4. A workshop series devoted to career assessment and planning. The workshops will address such issues as financial management, early retirement, and career transitions. Project planners have identified various resource people in the community to lead these workshops.

RAC's professional development project is open to faculty in the six contributing schools. Faculty from other RAC schools may participate on an individual-fee basis. Participation is completely voluntary and the plans and activities of involved faculty are kept confidential. If an individual designs a plan requiring leave time, he or she must, of course, consult with the dean or administrator who can authorize the absence. Otherwise, the project provides an opportunity for faculty to consider career options without anyone at his or her home institution knowing about it.

What are the program's outcomes?

RAC's professional development project is still in an embryonic stage, so it is too early to evaluate its impact. Program planners estimated that 25 to 30 faculty would use the program's services during its first year of full operation, but participation has not yet reached that level.

What are the program's costs and funding sources?
Expenses for a fully implemented program will include salaries for administration and counseling, costs for workshop development, library materials, travel, and publicity.

Program planner Dr. Lucienne Entenberg concludes that staff time and advertising services make up the major expenses in the preliminary stages of a program of this nature. She reports that large amounts of time are required to locate appropriate community resources, identify consultants, and work out the logistics of internships and other career development activities. She stresses that extensive publicity is essential to the success of career development programs, especially those involving multiple institutions.

At present, six RAC institutions contribute directly to the project. Several other schools have agreed to pay a fee for any of their faculty who wish to participate. The consortium contributes office space, support services, and some released time for a faculty member to continue development of the project. Some RAC faculty and staff are contributing time to the project on an overload basis in order to keep costs at a minimum.

Additional funding and staff will be necessary to implement the comprehensive program as it was originally designed.

For further information contact:
Dr. Alexander R. Cameron, executive director, Rochester Area Colleges, Inc., Cutler Union, 560 University Avenue, Rochester, New York 14607; or Dr. Lucienne C. Entenberg, Department of Foreign Languages, SUNY at Geneseo, Geneseo, New York 14454.

Available materials include:
Letter to RAC faculty outlining the services offered by the career development program.

Western Michigan University*
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Western Michigan University is a state-supported institution of approximately 20,000 undergraduate and graduate students located in Kalamazoo, in the southwestern portion of the lower peninsula of Michigan. Founded in 1903, it became a university in 1957; this date marked a period of rapid growth in which enrollments went

---

**This program description was prepared by Lonnie Supnick, former associate director for the program.*

from about 5,500 to a peak of about 22,000 in the early '70s. The university has an Office of Instructional Development and extensive programs for the support of research through sabbatical leave, travel, and project grants.

Why was the program initiated?

By the mid-'70s enrollment shifts from traditionally popular areas and prospects for overall enrollment decline led to the initiation of layoff procedures in some areas of the university. Though no faculty were laid off, it is probable that this was a factor in the subsequent election of the AAUP as bargaining agent and the signing of the first faculty union contract in 1976. The second contract, signed in 1978, contained an agreement to establish a faculty development program to "help to meet the demand for new or changed services which traditionally have been met by hiring new faculty, and otherwise to assist faculty in revitalizing their professional skills." Specifically, the faculty development program was seen as a means of avoiding layoffs of faculty by providing retraining and opportunities to redeploy in areas of high need.

The two years of discussion and planning that led to the creation of an Office of Faculty Development were characterized by deep divisions concerning both the philosophy and strategy of faculty development. Some called for a program aimed exclusively at defining policies and procedures related to retraining and redeployment of faculty within the university, while others argued for a broad-based approach to include professional, career, and personal development along with retraining. In addition, conflicts and mistrust generated by the strike that preceded the second contract adversely affected attitudes toward faculty development. Such differences and negative feelings were still present when the Office of Faculty Development was being established on a part-time basis in the spring of 1979.

What are the program's principal elements?

The Office of Faculty Development was given full-time staffing in October 1980, and enunciated the following goals:

1. Develop programs that will enable WMU to meet demands for new or changing services using existing faculty resources;
2. Assist faculty toward their own professional, career, and personal development goals.
3. Support departments and colleges in their own faculty development efforts; and
4. Make recommendations and develop proposals concerning policies that affect faculty development.

Although the director of the office is the associate vice president for academic affairs, its principal active officer, the associate director, is a faculty member on leave from a neighboring institution, who began work with small groups of interested faculty and administrators to formulate specific programs and activities. In a four-month period between December and March the following were initiated:

1. A brochure announcing the office;
2. The first in a series of newsletters describing services and faculty development opportunities;
3. A tuition-subsidy program to facilitate faculty development through course work at WMU;
4. A career renewal workshop for faculty;
5. Opportunities for individual career counseling;
6. Assistance in planning professional internships outside academia;
7. Planning for a pre-retirement workshop;
8. Discussions with the union, administration, and other relevant groups concerning policies that affect faculty development.

These occurred in the context of discussions with a number of groups and individuals to provide information about the new office and to determine faculty perceptions of needs and problems with respect to faculty development at WMU. Finally, during this time the important task of selecting the first WMU faculty member to work in this office was completed.

The philosophy behind these activities included a commitment to work with faculty and others who had a vested interest in faculty development and to build programs slowly and informally, rather than launching a fully-defined set of programs and procedures. Further, there was a commitment to approaching the problems of retrenchment in a broad way, rather than focusing only upon mechanisms to retrain and redeploy faculty. The inclusion of the career renewal workshop, career counseling, and preretirement workshop reflects this commitment; one shared by many, but not all of those involved in the original planning.

What are the program's outcomes?

In its first four months, the office has overcome a campus-wide sense of inertia about the faculty development program and many are more optimistic about its future. The inclusion of a broad range of faculty development issues has been welcomed by many, and a greater awareness of the range and complexity of faculty development problems is being fostered. On the other hand, there is no clear consensus about the direction taken by the Office of Faculty Development, among either faculty or administrators. There are many who believe that planning for the retraining and redeployment of tenured faculty faced with layoff is the only valid function for the office; this belief is pervasive even among those who have been closest to the office's evolution. The shared commitment to the goals of a faculty development program, which so many writers on this subject see as vital, is still lacking.

As with many other faculty development programs, the initial response to services and opportunities comes largely from those without tenure. The response of tenured faculty has been somewhat better to career renewal kinds of services than to opportunities for retraining to redeploy within the University.

What are the program's costs and funding sources?

Funding for the '80-81 academic year has come from the office of the vice president for academic affairs, which has paid for all direct costs as well as providing secretarial and other office services. As called for in previous committee recommendations, the principal officers of the faculty development program come from existing faculty and administrative positions without replacement, thus incurring little staffing cost. A budget projected for next year, which would provide for an expansion of the programs begun on a provisional basis this year, is lost in a sea of uncertainty about state and federal support for higher education. At worst, however, the program is likely to continue being funded on an ad hoc basis by academic affairs.

For further information contact:

Dr. Lonnie Supnick, (formerly associate director, Office of Faculty Development, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008) currently—Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49007.

Available materials include:

Final Report of the Joint WMU/AAUP Faculty Development Committee, October 1979.
Brochure: *Office of Faculty Development*, January 1981.
Various newsletters and announcements to faculty.

Multidimensional/Comprehensive Career Services

	Concordia College	Illinois State	Linfield College	Loyola University of Chicago
Main objective	Coordinate long-range institutional objectives with faculty professional growth opportunities	Effective use of human resources to maintain institutional vitality	Maintain faculty flexibility and morale during declining enrollment and economic conditions	Help faculty take an active role in their own career development
Services				
Career assessment and planning	Workshops on retirement planning and mid-career change	Individual consultation for faculty considering career alternatives	Day-long career planning workshop; individual follow-up consultation for faculty considering career change	Two sequential workshops on integrating personal and professional goals; technical workshops to develop specific employment seeking skills
Retraining	Fund individual and group retraining projects	Fund retraining for alternative careers or new roles and responsibilities within the institution	Fund faculty who wish to develop new teaching area through off-campus study	Retraining funds available for faculty who wish to move into new academic career or satisfy changed requirements
Experiential learning	Funds available to support faculty exchanges	Educational leave may involve internships	————	Temporary placements in non-academic organizations; internal and external exchange proprograms

Multidimensional/Comprehensive Career Services, cont.

	Concordia College	Illinois State	Linfield College	Loyola University of Chicago
Other	Reviewing personnel policies related to faculty vitality and mobility	Library of vocational information; specific services such as resume preparation	Fund faculty participation in career change workshops off-campus; advisory committee to help individual faculty make career growth plans and carry them out.	Time and financial management workshops; informal career support groups
Participation	Open to all faculty. 60-70 participants in first year	Open to all faculty; preference to tenured faculty. 40 on educational leave between 1977 and 1979	Open to all faculty; preference to mid-career faculty especially wishing to develop a competence needed by the college. 60-65 participants in first year	Open to all full-time faculty, administrators, trained staff, and their spouses. 75 participants per year
Administration	Administered by vice president for academic affairs	Neutral agency unrelated to faculty evaluation system	Administered by coordinator of faculty development	Administered through separate office
Funding	Northwest Area Foundation and college funds	Originally funded by Kellogg Foundation; now funded by university	Northwest Area Foundation grant	FIPSE grant and university funds
Duration	3 years	Continuing	16 months	3 years

Multidimensional/Comprehensive Career Services, cont.

	Rochester Area Colleges	Western Michigan University
Main objective	Help faculty explore new roles in and out of higher education and help member institutions achieve more flexible staffing	Meet the demand for new services traditionally met by hiring new faculty and to revitalize professors' professional skills
Services		
Career assessment and planning	Individual career testing and planning available through two member institutions; career asessment and planning workshops	Career renewal workshop, individual career counseling
Retraining	Faculty can enroll for courses at reduced costs at some member institutions	Tuition-subsidy program enabling faculty to take courses on campus
Experiential learning	Internships in nonacademic settings	Assist faculty to plan nonacademic internships

Multidimensional/Comprehensive Career Services, cont.

	Rochester Area Colleges	Western Michigan University
Other	Library of career development information	Newsletter describing program services; planning preretirement workshop; initial dialogue on policies that influence faculty development
Participation	Open to faculty from the six contributing institutions plus other RAC faculty on individual fee basis. Expect 25 to 30 per year	Open to all full-time board-appointed faculty. Approximately 50 in first semester's operation
Administration	Administered through consortium office	Administered through Office of Faculty Development
Funding	Contributions from six institutions plus consortium support	Institutional funds
Duration	Indefinite	Indefinite

Academic Career Transition Projects

Programs designed specifically to help academics change career paths have blossomed in recent years. We are aware of seven programs currently in operation. This development is a direct response to two significant trends—the decrease in academic positions available to new Ph.D's and restricted opportunities available to established faculty for career growth and advancement.

Although each of these programs has unique qualities, they all have the same overall objective—to help people with traditional academic credentials establish rewarding careers in the non-academic world. The programs rest on the assumption that graduate training develops many practical skills that can be as useful in the for-profit and public service sectors as they are in higher education institutions.

The academic career change programs generally are designed for people trained in the humanities and social sciences. Participants are frequently in the early stages of an academic career—new Ph.D's or individuals who have not yet completed the dissertation. The programs usually are not designed exclusively for faculty at a specific institution, rather, they bring together academics from different colleges and universities. Some programs do, however, limit participation to their own graduate students and alumni.

Most programs have two major functions: orientation and training for non-academic organizations (primarily businesses), and career research, planning and placement. The purpose of the organizational training is to equip academics with the vocabulary, understanding, and skills basic to professional positions in business and other non-academic sectors. Participants receive intensive instruction in subjects like accounting, statistics, economics, marketing, and management. In addition to their classroom experience, they often visit various types of firms to gain firsthand knowledge of how they operate. Participants also meet informally with industry representatives to discuss careers in fields such as market research, financial analysis, and publishing.

The aim of the career planning activities is to help the Ph.D's locate realistic and satisfying vocational alternatives. Initially, participants sort out their professional values and objectives and idenfy skills and knowledge they can transfer to other employment settings. They also conduct research to learn more about particular positions and organizations that interest them. Frequently, successful career changers are invited to share their experiences and insights with program participants.

As the decision-making process proceeds, the workshops usually address resume preparation, productive interviewing techniques, and job search strategies. Many Ph.D. career change programs assist in the placement process by arranging individual interviews between program participants and interested employers.

The programs usually run from six to twelve weeks and enroll 25 to 60 participants. Tuition varies from $500 to $1,250. Each program provides a different range of materials and services. Some also receive subsidies from various sources, thus the wide-ranging fees.

We have very little empirical data on the outcomes of Ph.D. career change programs. The available information, however, does suggest that these projects have helped move academics to positions in business and other non-academic sectors. For example, participants in NYU's Careers in Business Project have found a wide variety of opportunities, including positions as economic consultants, research associates, management interns, and personnel officers. Within two months of the University of Virginia's first institute, participants had positions in such diverse organizations as a multi-national petroleum company, stock brokerages, state and federal government agencies.

There are, of course, important differences in each of the programs designed to prepare advanced graduate students and Ph.D's for non-academic careers. Therefore, it is best to contact the programs individually for specific information:

Harvard Introduction to Business Program for Ph.D's (Harvard alumni only): Donna G. Martyn, executive director, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University, Byerly Hall 205, 8 Garden Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Careers in Business Project—New York University: John Wendland, assistant dean for student affairs, Graduate School of Business, Nichols Hall, New York University, 100 Trinity Place, New York, New York 10006

Careers in Business for Ph.D's—UCLA (University of California graduates only): Patricia Katsky, coordinator, Ph.D's in Business Program, Office of Executive Education, UCLA Graduate School of Management, Suite 2381, Los Angeles, California 90024

Alternative Careers Program—University of Pennsylvania: Peter Conn, director, Wharton Graduate Corporate Placement, 4025 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Careers in Business—University of Texas at Austin (only for affiliates of the University of Texas at Austin): Mary Lynn McGuire, assistant director, Placement Office, College of Business

Administration, University of Texas at Austin, Graduate School Building, Room 2.114, Austin, Texas 78712

Career Opportunities Institute for Ph.D's in the Humanities and Social Sciences – University of Virginia: Lawrence A. Simpson, director, Office of Career Planning and Placement, Minor Hall, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

Scholars in Transition

Institute for Research in History
New York, New York

At present, only one external academic career change program, Scholars in Transition, is geared specifically to the needs of tenured college faculty. This project is sponsored by The Institute for Research in History and supported by a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.

Unlike other career change programs, Scholars in Transition does not offer intensive coursework in the operations of non-academic organizations. Rather, it concentrates primarily on the career change process. The program proceeds through four phases:

1. A period of self-appraisal to develop an inventory of skills and occupational preferences.
2. An examination of profit and non-profit sectors and the professional opportunities within them.
3. Study of the mechanics of a job search campaign (e.g., resume development, the interview process, executive recruitment firms).
4. Development of a detailed six-month plan of action based on the individual's personal and professional goals.

The Scholars in Transition program runs for 12 weeks and is being offered three times during 1981. There is no charge for the program, but participants are responsible for their travel and housing costs. The first 12-week session began in February 1981, and no program evaluation data are available at this time.

For further information contact:
Mary Hayes Somers or Carl Zangerl, The Institute for Research in History, 55 West 44th Street, New York, New York 10036

Regis College

Denver, Colorado

Regis College is a small undergraduate institution operated by the Society of Jesus. The College employs 63 full-time faculty and offers programs in arts and sciences and administrative sciences. Regis recognizes the benefits of maintaining a flow of talent in and out of the academy and supports an active professional leave program.

Why was the program initiated?

Aware of projected trends for higher education, a special college committee studied alternative ways to preserve faculty vitality. In particular, the committee investigated early retirement plans. However, because the median age of Regis faculty is around 45, the committee concluded that a mid-career change program would probably have a greater impact on faculty than would an early retirement policy.

What are the program's principal elements?

The Regis plan is aimed specifically at faculty who wish to leave academe. Tenured faculty who have taught at the college for 10 years or more may choose from two major economic supports. The first option aids faculty who wish to leave higher education to retrain for another profession. The college will pay any eligible faculty member a full year's salary, in 26 installments or one lump sum, plus provide all other benefits (e.g., retirement, health and life insurance) for one year. In addition, at the end of the second year participant receives a $3,000 redirection grant. A participating faculty member leaves the college, relinguishes tenure at Regis, and agrees not to take another position in a higher education institution for at least three years.

The second career change option provides compensatory salary for faculty who take a nonacademic position at a lower rate of pay. The College will make up any disparity between the faculty salary and the new nonacademic salary for three years. Under this option upon acceptance of alternative employment the former faculty member relinguishes his or her tenure plus all college benefits.

Both career change options permit faculty or any member of their family taking advantage of tuition remission at the college to continue using it for three years or until completing a degree, whichever comes first. The college also designates mid-career changers as Faculty Alumni. This recognition is intended to retain former faculty within a network of people closely allied with the College.

Faculty enter the program on a strictly voluntary basis. The personnel office can provide information on appropriate community and professional agencies. The dean of the college makes necessary transition arrangements with the faculty member's department chair.

What are the program's outcomes?

The Regis Mid-Career Change program was formally approved in March 1981. Two of the College's 63 faculty members have taken advantage of the program to date. The program is based on the assumption that approximately one percent of the faculty will leave the college each year under its two economic support options.

What are the program's costs and funding sources?

The program involves essentially no administrative expenditures. Costs principally involve salaries for departing faculty plus salaries for their part-time replacements for one year. After the year in which a departing faculty receives full salary, the college will hire a full-time replacement. The salary deficit experienced during the first year will be offset by employment of a faculty member at lower rank and salary. All costs of the program are underwritten by the College.

For further information contact:

Dr. William J. Hynes, assistant dean, Regis College, West 50th Avenue and Lowell Boulevard, Denver, Colorado 80221

The Community College Sector: A Special Look

Our effort to tap into the community college information network yielded very few formal initiatives. It is quite likely that our cursory survey failed to locate some significant two-year college programs designed to expand faculty career options. However, the difficulty we encountered in identifying such programs suggests that the current level of activity is quite limited.

What follows is a summary of the institutional responses our investigation uncovered. Not all of these activities represent conscious career renewal programs. However, each provides opportunities for faculty to assess their career prospects or gain new experiences and skills.

Prince George's Community College
Largo, Maryland

In accordance with its ten-year plan, the Career Center at Prince George's Community College is extending its services to faculty and administrators. A 12-week course on life/work planning and career development is now available specifically for full-time professional personnel. The course uses a combination text and workbook, *Your Career: Choices, Chances and Changes*, written by Career Center staff.

Course topics include decision-making, skills and special knowledge identification, and values clarification. Participants try to work out the type of work environment they prefer, the activities they wish to perform, and the level of responsibility they desire. These decisions shape the vocational options that would be satisfying to the individual. The course also addresses the process of career movement. Participants plan strategy for achieving their career goals, for example, a promotion, role change, or job in a new setting.

The career planning course also provides a foundation for preparing some faculty and administrators to teach career planning to college students.

For further information contact:
Fontelle Gilbert, Career Center, Prince George's Community College, 301 Largo Road, Largo, Maryland 20870

Lansing Community College
Lansing, Michigan

Lansing Community College has developed a series of programs on burnout and stress which the Professional Development Office uses in workshops with faculty and staff volunteers concerned about their professional vitality.

Three videotape presentations form the core of the six-week series. The videotape sessions are alternated with small-group discussions about burnout and stress experiences in the daily lives of participants. Group members keep journals as a means of tracking what is happening to them socially and emotionally.

The program is aimed at encouraging individual solutions to career problems. Its primary objective is to help people identify bothersome aspects of their jobs that they can change and plan strategies for improvement. The program has been run several times on the LCC campus. Specific outcomes have not been assessed, however John Cooper, professional development director, feels that the program has facilitated communication and support across campus. In particular, Cooper believes that the small groups have reduced the organizational isolation experienced by some college personnel. Some participants in the burnout/stress program have gone on to other positions, others have made changes in their present work environment such as in the way they relate to their colleagues.

For further information contact:
John Cooper, director of professional development, Lansing Community College, Lansing, Michigan 48901

Maricopa Community Colleges
Phoenix, Arizona

Maricopa Community Colleges comprise a seven-campus district in metropolitan Phoenix, Arizona. In recent years, Maricopa's staff development program has offered several career/life planning activities. In 1979-80 the College provided a day-long career/life planning workshop for students, faculty, and counselors led by John Crystal, author of *Where Do I Go from Here with My Life*.

In 1980-81 the staff development program offered a televised course entitled "New Perspectives on Mid-Life." This course, developed by the University of South Florida, covers such topics as theories of mid-life, family patterns, and financial considerations. Faculty and staff members gathered weekly to view the programs and discuss the issues raised.

For further information contact:
Margaret Haddad, faculty/staff development specialist, Maricopa Community College District, 3910 East Washington Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85034

Miami-Dade Community College
Miami, Florida

Miami-Dade Community College provides faculty retraining in response to enrollment trends and curriculum changes. Currently, 94 faculty in the natural and social sciences and the humanities are participating in a seminar to prepare them to teach in a new general education program. In place of teaching discrete courses in their original disciplines, these instructors are learning to teach single general education courses that cover several fields, such as, art, drama, music, and philosophy. The College provides released time for faculty volunteers to attend the retraining seminars.

Under-utilized Miami-Dade faculty may also retrain to teach in areas of growing enrollment. For example, the college's South Campus recently gave a history instructor released time to enroll in Miami-Dade economics courses. To date, however, faculty have not used this option extensively. The institution also has a policy to assist under-utilized faculty by moving them from campuses with declining enrollments to campuses that are growing.

For further information contact:
Dr. Maureen Lukenbill, director of staff development, Miami-Dade Community College–South Campus, Miami, Florida 33176

Dallas County Community College District
Dallas, Texas

The seven-campus Dallas County Community College District offers an internal internship program for faculty and staff. Participants design their internship experience in cooperation with the administrative unit where they wish to work. Individuals may take an internship to acquire specific information and skills, to see how they like administrative work, or they may regard the novel work experience primarily as an opportunity for personal and professional renewal. Interns attend four workshops on operational and management procedures. The workshops cover information crucial to successful administrators and provide an opportunity for participants to get acquainted with colleagues from other campuses and to expand their awareness of college-wide issues.

Approximately 20 people participate in the program each year. Internships are part-time and participants must continue to perform their normal work responsibilities. Faculty usually engage in their internship activities during office-hour time. This gives them approximately 10 hours per week to devote to their project. Internships vary in length from three weeks to a full academic year. The program has very few expenses; because faculty carry on their full range of regular duties, no replacements need to be hired.

For further information contact:
Ms. Jackie Caswell, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Dallas County Community College District, 701 Elm Street, Dallas, Texas 75202

De Anza College
Cupertino, California

Analysis of demographic and market trends indicated that De Anza College's enrollment of traditional-aged college students would probably decline in the future. These projections, coupled with changing course selection patterns had significant career implications for faculty, particularly those teaching in college transfer programs. As a consequence of these circumstances, De Anza has developed several services to help its faculty prepare for needed career adjustments.

De Anza's career development activities make up one of the most comprehensive community college efforts to expand faculty career options. The three major program components are a career transition workshop, professional retraining opportunities, and non-academic internships.

The career transition workshop was first offered in July of 1980. Based on that experience, it has been redesigned and now consists of a three-month course for 10 faculty volunteers. The course meets weekly for three hours and individual counseling complements class activities. Course topics include analysis of transferable employment skills, labor market research, time management, and job analysis. Workshop leader Ken Dutter calls this "putting a job on the couch" to determine if it is really the kind of position the person wants. Also included are role-playing and salary negotiation techniques to prepare participants for employment interviews.

The college also provides $25,000 per year to fund faculty and staff retraining in areas where the institution has a growing need. Faculty may qualify for a stipend and released time to acquire new knowledge and expertise.

De Anza's faculty internship program begins in July 1981. Faculty interns will work in non-academic settings for a period of two to six months. Internships will provide a mechanism for faculty, particularly those in vocational-technical fields to stay up-to-date in their subject areas and give an opportunity to try out potential employment alternatives. Interns will receive their regular faculty salary and the College plans to make up the difference between the faculty member's salary and the amount paid by the organization where he or she interns.

De Anza's career development services are a means to adapt the institution and its personnel to changing consumer demands. In spite of their very recent development, the services already have produced significant results. For example, two faculty who participated in the first transition workshop have left the college, and one is considering early retirement. Likewise, a philosopher is using retraining funds to earn a master's degree in economics, and an English professor is preparing to teach in the College's program for senior citizens.

Thus far, costs have included salaries for the program administrator and workshop instructor, clerical support, consultants, outside speakers, and retraining stipends. Most of the program funding has come directly from the College's budget. Some funds for the internship project are expected in the form of a grant from the chancellor's office.

For further information contact:
Mr. James Lucas or Mr. Kenneth Dutter, Staff Development Office, De Anza College, 2150 Stevens Creek Boulevard, Cupertino, California 95014

Retrospect

It is important to emphasize that our study concentrated on formal projects explicitly intended to add new dimensions to faculty careers. Therefore, the activities presented in this report underestimate the myriad of personnel policies, individual growth projects, faculty development workshops, and new role assignments which, in the routine course of institutional operations, permit faculty to move in new career directions. Recognizing this significant qualification, our survey of explicit academic career renewal projects leads to several conclusions about current activity and desirable next steps.

We learned that formal projects are underway throughout the United States at all types of higher education institutions. This indicates that the issue is not regional or limited to particular types of colleges and universities. However, the small number of projects we identified suggests that relatively few higher education institutions are consciously addressing the need for new options for faculty. The range of career development projects is encouraging, nevertheless. It shows a considerable degree of creative problem-solving among institutions that have recognized the benefits of aiding faculty with their career development.

Only a few of the projects we studied had any concrete evidence of their success or failure. Some efforts to determine which career renewal services work and which don't would be very enlightening for institutions considering what approach to take on their own campus.

We have noted several significant deficiencies or omissions in recent academic career renewal projects. For example, only one project seriously considered the connection between faculty careers and institutional policies. We believe that colleges and universities can stimulate academic career growth by developing policies that encourage faculty to try non-traditional roles and acquire new skills. Flexible leave policies, broadened evaluation and reward criteria, and early or phased retirement programs each could foster career renewal.

Likewise, very few current programs offer a comprehensive, sequential approach to academic career development. Many initiatives, such as retraining programs, respond to a particular institutional need but fail to give full attention to the career objectives of individual faculty. Similarly, most programs do not follow an orderly sequence of career development stages. Many career planning workshops, non-academic internships, etc., seem to be one-shot affairs. They give faculty the opportunity to grow professionally and then return them to their original, unchanged—and often unsupportive—environment. Based on our review, we conclude that career development services should provide a series of related activities that help faculty move from the process of career assessment and planning through to the next logical step in their overall career plan.

Perhaps most problematic is the fact that many of the projects currently in operation are quite costly. Federal, state, and private foundation funds have provided the necessary financial margin to get some projects started. A few of the programs described in this report terminated with the conclusion of their outside funding. The next several years undoubtedly will impose new financial constraints on higher education. Therefore, it seems imperative to design less costly means for faculty to diversify their careers. Projects and policies that can operate within the limits of an institution's general budget are essential. Otherwise, academic career renewal programs may fall in the first wave of budget cuts.

Designing New Projects

The attempt to create new career options for faculty leads program designers into three arenas of activity. First, faculty must themselves come to a point where they reflect upon the relationship between their personal values on the one hand, and their current roles and career commitments on the other. From the perspective of institutional management, this is a matter of establishing career assessment as a legitimate and accepted process. Second, new roles must be created within colleges and universities, so that interested faculty can pursue new career options. Third, new roles must be created outside academic settings, so that these new options might also be explored.

Reexamining Academic Careers as a Legitimate Process

Janet Hagberg

When we talk about reexamining careers or "career assessment," we refer to a lifelong process by which people think about their lives and their work and make decisions about their future. It involves deliberate and reflective analysis. Career assessment combines emotion and reason. It is not therapy, though it may be therapeutic. It is not easy, but it may be satisfying. The result may be a reaffirmation of one's present life/work situation, a change of life style, a change within one's present job, or a more dramatic change in one's profession.

What are the points at which faculty now reassess their careers during the normal course of their professional lives? What is missing? Let us consider four "career assessment traditions" in higher education, and weigh each of them:

1. The Hiring/Promotion Tradition. The formal decision times at which faculty are hired, promoted, and granted tenure are certainly important times for the faculty themselves to consider their careers. But one wonders how effective these occasions are for reflective thinking about values, work motivation and skills and options. The stress factor is usually quite high, and the evaluative criteria so fixed that it is difficult to provide diagnostic and constructive feedback at the same time. Moreover, these points all typically fall early in the career of a faculty member. There are few occasions post-tenure when colleges even raise the issue.

2. The Supervising Tradition. Deans and department heads frequently talk with faculty about their work, but these discussions are typically ad hoc, and provoked by problems. Rarely is there an annual review of the faculty member's career.
3. The Mentor Tradition. Experienced faculty often serve as mentors to younger faculty, showing them the ropes, listening, encouraging, challenging. The life and career decisions made over a cup of coffee are probably the most effective. There is more honesty, more willingness to share feelings here than in any formal process. But the problem is that these relationships are ad hoc and chancy. "Mentoring" is itself something that needs to be encouraged systematically.
4. The Self-Reflective Tradition. Faculty are readers and thinkers and, like most people, spend time during particular periods of their lives thinking and worrying over their careers. The problem is that "private thinking" often is not sufficient. It is helpful and sometimes essential to clear thinking to talk with someone during the process.

In sum, the formal points at which colleges raise the issues are not necessarily the best or most productive times for the individual faculty. And the informal traditions of assessment are not recognized or accepted as on-going activities that deserve institutional encouragement. Few colleges have any kind of program to prepare academic administrators for their counseling roles. Few colleges have resource centers or other types of reinforcement for career assessment.

Why should colleges be interested in doing any more than they do? First, colleges have a responsibility to maintain the quality of their faculty. Some administrators fear that if faculty indeed became more self-conscious about their careers, and more aware of options, "the best faculty would leave." But is a faculty member who would rather be somewhere else really performing at his or her "best" level? Is someone permanently "best," or don't we all go through stages of growth and change? Experiencing assessment usually makes individuals more realistic and often leads, not to dramatic departures, but to necessary personal and professional adjustments.

Second, issues of morale are critical at a time of slowed or no growth. By leading faculty to new options, career assessment programs may rebound to the benefit of the college itself – by producing new staffing patterns, cost efficiencies, and other changes.

Third, the values of a college are reflected in the way it treats its faculty. Colleges with a humane tradition of caring about their faculty become places where the faculty communicate a similar concern about their students.

Is there anything unique about faculty careers that should be taken into account? If we reflect on the nature of an academic career, there are some distinct differences to note. First, faculty by and large drifted into their roles rather than actively choosing them. Many faculty became entranced with a subject and followed the lead of a major professor whom they admired. By the time they had been socialized via the dissertation they were deeply invested in the profession. Since faculty see themselves primarily as knowledge specialists, their major allegiance is to their subject matter and to professional associations. For faculty to consider other skills besides those associated with their teaching, or to consider other subject matter possibilities, may be threatening or distasteful. Certainly the dissonance is high. Second, the most prevalent career track for faculty is narrowly defined; younger faculty feel they have few options. Third, faculty live rather autonomous and isolated existences. They value the independence and freedom this offers but they lack the wider contacts and interdepartmental exchange that occurs on a regular basis in other work settings.

Who are the clientele of career assessment programs? Although most programs to date have focused on the individual and his or her career at the initial stage, mid-life, or preretirement, that seems to be just a beginning. The level and range of interest, even on the most prestigious campuses, should not be underestimated. All faculty and administrators at various stages of life, eventually may want to be involved. Spouses are an important factor and should be encouraged to participate at whatever level possible. The second major group that needs to be considered are the academic administrative managers (department chairpersons, deans) who manage other people, consider policy issues, and mentor younger faculty. Career assessment for them is a legitimate topic pertaining to institutional development and long-range planning. Without support from these people, many of the faculty efforts could be thwarted.

What are the general characteristics of a good career assessment program? The collective wisdom of those with experience in career assessment is that there are various ways to initiate activities, but the following ingredients are necessary:

1. Voluntary participation. No matter what activities are provided, participation should be voluntary according to personal needs and interests. Although specific segments of the institution may be invited to participate, no one should be expected to make a commitment to long-term involvement against his or her wishes.

2. Variety of activities. The ways in which people are most comfortable learning about their own career issues and alternatives may be quite diverse. Some may want bibliographies to choose from for individual reading, while others prefer talking to another person or attending a workshop on career renewal, financial planning, or time management. Total programs may include such widely divergent elements as bibliographic information, individual counseling, resource centers, speakers, seminars, conferences, research reports, support groups, faculty retraining programs, policy changes, and internships.

3. Institutional assessment. The most successful programs are those in which the career assessment project becomes a part of a larger institutional assessment. Certain policy changes are usually necessary in order to support individual career revisions. How will these be assured or at least discussed openly? The total climate on which career assessment takes place may greatly affect the assessment's outcomes since ideas without support or opportunity may produce increased frustration. Career assessment can be one step toward further institutional development or may be incorporated into current development plans. For instance, career assessment may affect the projections for faculty positions or staff redistribution in the next several years.

What are some strategies for gaining support and getting started on a career assessment program? Along with an overall rationale for a career assessment program, it is useful to consider which strategies would work best on a particular campus. The following is a compendium of ideas from a variety of current programs.

1. Insure faculty ownership. The most accepted and supported programs have faculty ownership and administrative support. It does not matter as much who initiates activity as long as faculty are strongly involved. If there is no faculty leadership, programs could be seen as administrative interferences.

2. Move deliberately. Although the topic of career assessment is legitimate for most faculty, it must be approached carefully because of a need for confidentiality, an acceptable forum, trust, and support from the institution. Do not underestimate the interest but, on the other hand, do not expect 100 people to sign up for a career *change* seminar. Here are some suggestions for raising the issue deliberately: disseminate written material–articles, book reviews, reviews of current literature or current career practices; start a campus newsletter or add to one in existence; circulate books on the topic or related issues; sponsor a speech for interested faculty on career renewal, financial planning, preretirement.

3. Circulate a questionnaire to faculty asking for their confidential responses to life and career planning questions.

4. Fund research within the institution on faculty careers and faculty development; send a campus leader to a faculty development workshop elsewhere.

5. Sponsor a pilot series of workshops. Although these workshops work best on a voluntary basis, special groups may be invited–senior professors, young untenured faculty, faculty at mid-life. It is important to include campus leaders and, if possible, to have a mix of people in different life/work situations and from different institutions. It is also desirable to include spouses.

6. Extend faculty development programs. If the institution has a successful faculty development program, career assessment may be a logical step for extending these services. There may already be people trained in career development areas who have worked closely with faculty on other development issues such as teaching improvement.

7. Prepare a faculty member as a resource. Train one or several faculty members to serve as an informal resource, "counselor," workshop leader and allow part of his or her faculty load to include career assessment activities. The persons may be alumni of the workshop series and then become ongoing leaders of similar workshops.

8. Secure funding. Start with the activities that cost the least amount to generate interest or legitimize the issues. Use any possible institutional funding available, such as travel or research funds. Ask faculty to contribute a portion of their costs of participation. Seek outside funding for program efforts that have the ownership and support of faculty leaders and commitment from the administration. It is very important to an ongoing program's success that the program be integrated into the institution after the initial funding source is depleted. Current programs have been supported by foundation grants, federal funds, consortia funds, union funds, institutional matching funds, professional development program funds, presidents' discretionary funds, and faculty contributions.

9. Overcome impediments. The source of most impediments is threefold: the individual, the outside expert or program consultant, and the institution. On the individual level, inviting people to consider change may call up some old fears, lingering doubts, buried feelings that must be confronted gently. Some faculty may feel their very foundations quaking beneath them, others may revel in the experience. With the process of change there will be a variety of associated feelings including confusion, loss of control, excitement, disenchantment, or fear that cannot be overlooked. Men particularly seem to have a more difficult time with the emotional issues involved in the process.

Be cautious of consultants. Some consultants have no background or training in human development, career assessment, or counseling; no personal experience with career development issues; a very narrow approach (the one-answer person); an unrealistic view of the complexity of the issues; no plans for follow-through or evaluation. It might seem logical to consider using the placement officer on campus, although at many institutions this would not be accepted by many faculty as a good starting point. Also be very wary of search firms that make big promises and charge a lot of money before they deliver. Be especially watchful for glossy, canned programs that contain little substance or information of relevance to the particular needs of faculty, programs that are too short and sound too good to be true ("change your life in a one-day seminar"), or that cost too much or too little.

Institutional impediments include lack of support or vision, policy restrictions, isolated location that complicates cooperative programs, restriction of faculty ownership, authoritarian attitudes, using such a program as a last resort to save a dying institution, and restrictive or no financial support.

What do we know about career assessment workshop experiences? Having delineated the range of strategies for beginning a program, it may help us to take a closer look at the information we have about some specific kinds of programs that have served as starting points in several institutions.

1. Who attends? The faculty most likely to attend are middle aged (38-45), tenured with 9-13 years of service, both male and female, from a mix of disciplines, interested in looking at life/work options, and possibly experiencing current stress. Also represented are untenured faculty and those considering second careers or retirement. Faculty have said that they particularly enjoy the opportunity to meet and get to know faculty from other departments or colleges.

2. Where and when? It is generally better to get faculty away from their offices or conference rooms to a more restful atmosphere. Even meeting at another campus is desirable if funds are not available to use a retreat center or hotel. Programs that meet every week in the evening do not face the same problems with distractions that more concentrated seminar programs have. The process of career assessment takes time and thought. It cannot be compressed easily and there are no magic answers. Short seminars may get interest started in many areas, but for any long-term effects, the program must be of longer duration (e.g., 4-6 days over a 2-3 month period) followed by ongoing support by individuals or groups. Sometimes professional associations or discipline-sponsored programs are most appropriate, particularly if the individual is actively seeking a career change.

3. Who leads? Although on-campus faculty may have expertise in some areas, generally program consultants are brought in, at least initially, who are proven and trustworthy experts in the areas to be addressed. They may even train faculty as workshop leaders in a special series of training sessions beyond the workshop series if the institution wants an ongoing program using its own resources.

4. What content? Depending on the time allotted, faculty situations and interests, and leader expertise, the following are some of the areas that could be covered.

- faculty career patterns and trends
- adult development concepts
- values issues
- goal clarification
- personal style dimensions
- family issues
- skill and past work analysis
- financial planning
- stress management, life balance concepts
- risk taking and decision making
- individual options for life/work
- institutional options for faculty
- private sector and government career trends
- career change strategies
- networking
- interviewing
- internship information and opportunities
- faculty retraining opportunities
- case studies of career reassessors

5. Likely consequences? There has been very little systematic evaluation of programs to date although a few foundations will have several program evaluations available soon. The summaries from four or five programs point to a greater consciousness of career issues and a few specific results like designing new courses, gaining administrative skills, new opportunities to publish, increased expertise, and more leadership responsibilities. The formal and informal evaluation from leaders and participants strongly suggests that attitudinal changes have been quite significant. These are difficult to assess effectively but easy to see in colleagues over time.

One program initiated by the Pennsylvania State College System used formative evaluators to monitor their program for one and a half years. PSCS is a unionized system with 14 widely scattered campuses. In recent years, the system has been threatened by retrenchment. The faculty union initiated the program with a FIPSE grant. The program consisted of three, two-day workshops over three months (life planning, career renewal, career change), with faculty workshop leader training as an additional component. Fifty faculty members completed the workshops and 12 completed the additional training. Evaluation was conducted during the workshop, then six months and one year after the experience. The evaluation consisted of written assessments of each workshop, as well as interviews of a random sample of participants.

The short-term changes included greater self-esteem, increased control over one's life, more sensitivity to the needs of students, greater understanding of and ability to cope with stress, greater work satisfaction and willingness to assume more responsibility, better preparation for facing retrenchment positively. (In fact, two of three faculty who were given notice and then rehired, refused their positions after the workshops because of other options they had developed.)

On the long-term side, 73 percent of the participants responded to the one year follow-up. Of these, 76 percent cited specific examples of the use of the process in the last year; 52 percent of participants and 100 percent of faculty leaders experienced unintended consequences from the workshops – all but two had experienced significant events in their lives related to their profession (retirement, publishing, promotion, career change, retrenchment). There was a general increase in self-confidence and ability to take risks related to the process. Anecdotal information is rich with specific career renewal and change experiences, both painful and satisfying. There were no personally damaging experiences or results reported.

Designing New Roles Within Academe

Thomas Maher

It is helpful to picture the early stages of an academic career as a series of projects. A project, as the term is used here, is a set of related activities through which the faculty member moves toward a goal within a prescribed period of time. Projects serve to focus interest and intensify effort and require a basic commitment of time and endeavor from the faculty member. Writing a book, seeking a research grant, and designing a new course are all projects.

Most people possess, at any point in their careers, an inventory of projects. Some of these are likely to be fading, losing their share of one's interest, while others are growing in the importance the person attaches to them. Some of the projects are peripheral to one's career, some central. Some are seen as long-lived, and others, intentionally, are viewed as having a very limited life-span. There is probably an optimum number of projects that can engage our attention at one time, lest we become spread too thin or too single-minded.

Consider the faculty career from a "project" point-of-view. The professor-to-be must:

1. be admitted to a Ph.D. program;
2. complete preliminary exams;
3. choose a research topic;
4. complete a dissertation;
5. obtain a position;
6. do research and publish;
7. gain tenure.

Note that each of these seven projects is short-term in nature. They each contain many risks, to be sure, but also the promise of exhilarating accomplishment. For most faculty these projects are conducted in the midst of watchful peers who are at once supportive and competitive. At the same time, their projects are undertaken under the interested gaze of senior people: major professors, mentors, and senior faculty in the department. Ultimately, however, the initial stage of an academic career reinforces on achievement motive through a series of institutionalized accomplishments. Here, the die is cast for a pattern of thinking about the long-term nature of the university career.

There is no question that many faculty do continue to pursue productive research within their disciplines following tenure, but for many others the sense of being engaged in short-term, "applause-winning" projects diminishes. For a variety of reasons, many faculty drift, at mid-career, into a routine of teaching classes, updating syllabi, serving on committees, and perhaps "keeping a hand in" research. Most of these tasks, however, tend to become maintenance efforts and do not focus enthusiasm in the same way that the early career project sequence served to do.

The ability of the university to appreciate and actively support much greater diversity in the academic career will in large part determine its ability to maintain the conditions of professional renewal over the next decade. Yet, there is another element to the support of new faculty interests and that is the "welfare of the institutional enterprise" (Furniss 1981). Universities must challenge mid-career faculty to develop secondary career interests that not only energize the person in question, but are consistent with the mission of the institution as well.

To ensure its own welfare, the university must begin to understand the resource that is represented by the latent multiple talents residing in each of its faculty members and must create the means to encourage the emergence of secondary career interests that are of value to the individual and to the institution. The wide array of faculty talents are too often hidden by the one-life, one-career view of the academic profession. In particular, the university needs *internal consultants*—faculty who have expertise that can be called upon to help the university solve problems or create new programs. It must foster *conveners*—people who are organizers and who have the ability to bring together other faculty members for informal discussions of issues and ideas. In short, universities need people who can create community in its various units. The university also needs *bridgers*—persons who can span disciplines and develop the bases for interdisciplinary teaching and research groups. It must have *explorers*—individuals who size up emerging trends, interests, ideas, and new disciplines for possible implant in the university. It has to encourage *inventors*—people who can put together new courses and programs that work. It should support *extenders*—professors who parlay their expertise into broader areas of concern, such as the economist who moves into future studies. Finally, the university badly needs a means of recognizing the accomplishments of the people who assume these roles.

Many mid-career faculty who withdraw from the competitive and achievement-oriented world of high-level research turn to outside interests to sustain themselves. They eventually divert their creative energies almost exclusively to extra-institutional projects such as playing the stock market, dabbling in real estate, or running marathons. Most of us would agree that maintaining sanity requires absorbing external interests, but without some external/

institutional balance in one's inventory of projects, a good deal of potential energy is lost to the university.

Innovative faculty activities and roles

Despite the folklore about "deadwood" and the tendency of some faculty to turn almost exclusively to outside interests, a large, but mostly hidden, population of mid-career faculty are enthusiastically engaging in a wide variety of projects. Many of these seem potentially valuable to the university but are not located in what might traditionally be considered the province of tenured faculty. The following examples of emerging interests gleaned from the faculty of a state university can suggest implications for changes in university policy designed to support and sustain these interests:

- Faculty members in English move into women's studies; sociologists become gerontologists, and historians enlarge their interests to include American studies.
- Members of the chemistry and mathematics departments become experts in the use of micro-computers in teaching and act as on-campus consultants.
- A philosopher moves into the administration of cooperative education and develops new perspectives on how to engage undergraduates in the issue of work and its values.
- A historian becomes a mid-career expert on the Holocaust. He presents lectures to teachers in the local schools and leads a tour group to Dachau. He has been recognized for his outstanding contributions by the local chapter of the National Association of Christians and Jews.
- A professor of religion changes both his area of interest and his teaching style. He becomes interested in the near-death experience and "out-of-body" phenomena, and sees himself as a "producer of experiences" for students as opposed to a lecturer.
- A group of faculty from a variety of disciplines form an informal group around the idea of Near Eastern studies, develop interdisciplinary courses, and conduct conferences and workshops.
- An anthopologist is instrumental in beginning an on-campus discussion group entitled, Integrative Themes.
- An astronomer spends time on a project on institutional development and planning and, in the process, gains insight extremely helpful to the university.
- A speech professor becomes interested in the measurement of the psychological stages through which college students pass. He acts as a resource person on campus and is asked to present his experience in various national forums.

- A faculty member in journalism becomes a part-time counsultant to the university with the assignment of suggesting ways the institution can interpret its mission to the public.
- A psychology professor acts as a statistical consultant to the faculty.
- Several members of the faculty explore the possibilities of an administrative career through part-time internships on the campus.

This listing suggests many of the kinds of projects that could be of value to both the university and the individual. For example, we see in the projects of the faculty mentioned: *assumption* of new, interdisciplinary knowledge specialties; *development* of expertise in the area of educational technology; *building* of administrative competencies and utilization of particular talents to help solve problems encountered by the university; *organization* of faculty to explore new interdisciplinary options; and *creation* of new ways to understand how our students learn.

These projects represent the openness of American universities to a variety of activities and interests and they attest to the resiliency and inventiveness of many faculty. No doubt this list could be duplicated and even extended at most institutions of higher learning. As interesting as the list is, many of these projects will be abandoned, many will come to be seen as dead end, and, unfortunately, many will be viewed as illegitimate by peers. ("He *used* our department as a stepping stone," one faculty member commented angrily about a colleague who had recently moved into administration.)

Strategies for fostering new faculty interests

What, then, can be done to challenge members of a faculty to develop and sustain latent secondary interests, and what can be done to provide recognition for those faculty who reinvest their energies into diverse projects that are of value to the university. There is, of course, no single answer to these questions. Rather, I think, we need to explore a variety of policies designed both to challenge faculty to create new interests and to recognize and reward those ventures that show promise of providing the institution with a quality effort.

Here then, is a partial listing of some relatively inexpensive strategies a college or university can employ to call forth new interests from among its faculty.

Plan a program of short-term administrative internships. Most universities could easily establish five to ten internship slots each year in which members of the faculty could spend one-third or one-fourth of their time working with administrators on campus. A series of readings and periodic seminars can help illuminate the issues involved in administration. Not only does this kind of program provide those interested in administration with an opportunity to explore this possibility, it also creates new channels of communication and eventually seeds the faculty with individuals who have a much better sense of perspective about the university and the problems facing those in administration. In most cases, with some planning, a course can be covered by full-time faculty or adjuncts to release a portion of the faculty member's time for the internship.

Create issue experts to serve as internal consultants to the university. All institutions of higher learning will face a whole array of extremely difficult issues and problems over the next decade. In most cases, faculty and administrators try to cope as well as possible, given the many demands on their time and energy. If administrators can identify emerging and particularly difficult issues, why not identify and select several faculty members, assigning them to particular "issues" with the mandate to become an expert in this issue and to serve as a consultant to the university when needed? This project might require funding for travel to workshops or for residency in another location for a brief period of study. Not only would the university have an on-campus expert on issues such as collective bargaining, general education, retrenchment, or the academic/athletic relationship, but the faculty member also would have a new secondary interest that could lead to new professional contacts and, possibly, paid consultation. An ongoing faculty seminar on current higher education issues can help sustain and enlarge these interests and can begin to build the bases for a community of people sharing larger concerns about the university.

Recognize and reward those professors who can effectively provide continuing education for the faculty. In any faculty, there are many individuals who possess the competence to supply their colleagues with badly-needed information and ideas or with a critique of current practices. The wasteful underutilization of this resource is usually shrugged off with the cliche "no one is a prophet in his own land." This response is a head-in-the-sand failure to recognize the great resource any faculty is. There is no reason why certain faculty could not, as part of their formal load, be designated as consultants to faculty and graduate students in areas such as research design, statistics, group dynamics, conflict resolution, public speaking, and the like. Informal experience suggests that the use would exceed expectations and that new roles and interests would be developed by the faculty.

Support informal interdisciplinary groups. On many campuses, there is "spontaneous generation" of small, informal groups of faculty from various disciplines to explore and discuss topics, themes, and ideas that are integrative in nature and common to the disciplines involved. On one campus for example, there are groups on the Middle Ages, Asian studies, linguistics, and future studies. In most cases, these groups are ephemeral because those involved are doing the planning and organizing "out of their own hides." The costs of coordination, over time, often drain energy.

Many of these groups, however, create courses, hold conferences, and provide a setting for the exchange of ideas. In rare cases, they evolve into departments, centers, or institutes. One strategy an institution can take is to "adopt" one or more of these groups each year. The word "adopt" is used, not to imply control, but to suggest a minimum amount of funding for, say, a three-year period for holding conferences, travel for those involved, possible released time for an organizer or convener, small research grants, and other developmental activities. This, of course, is investment in an open-ended process. It does seem, however, that some temporary stability would create a setting in which new and broader intellectual interest might emerge.

Open the perception and reality of the sabbatical leave policy. The sabbatical leave is still the focus for professional development activities in the minds of many faculty. Although a number of institutions have broadened their concept of the purposes of a sabbatical leave, many of them—and many faculty—still view specialized research within one's field as the primary, and only legitimate reason for requesting a sabbatical leave. Colleges and universities must review their policies regarding sabbaticals and underscore the idea that at mid-career, faculty may pursue new professional interests or secondary specialties through this device. It is important to provide "living" examples of creative alternatives to the traditional uses of sabbaticals.

Encourage individual faculty to explore related fields and to enlarge their interests by examining them in larger intellectual contexts. Small grants for professional development have been a mainstay of many faculty enrichment programs. While some of these have, in fact, and unfocused activities, that do not have a lasting impact on the institution or faculty member. I would, however, urge institutions to develop a program that would provide small grants for faculty who could document efforts underway to extend their disciplines to interdisciplinary issue areas such as the economist moving toward urban studies, the sociologist to environmental concerns, the psychologist to gerontology. These monies could support the purchase of materials and travel to conferences. One of the major difficulties faculty encounter today is the travel-money policy of many institutions: Support goes only to those faculty presenting papers in their discipline association meetings.

Universities must consider the long-term consequences of this policy on the possibilities for renewal.

Develop a community of faculty interested in improving teaching. Although a major task of the contemporary university is to develop effective ways to teach a wide variety of persons, those who develop deep interests and expertise in new approaches to teaching often feel isolated and sometimes are considered "poor researchers" by their departmental colleagues. The improvement of teaching, however, is a *major* source of the new projects among faculty members.

Sustaining an interest in innovations in teaching requires a community of supportive colleagues in the same way that a research project requires an audience. Building an internal network can be enhanced by establishing a tradition of a major off-campus workshop on teaching held each year. If faculty from various departments are invited, a support group of sorts may begin to develop, sustained by other smaller events held at various times throughout the year. The point is that a network of teachers deflects criticism of individuals who are tentatively exploring new instructional strategies, and it provides a means of recognition for success.

Create major awards that recognize efforts in the direction of diversity. Recognition and affirmation are important elements in any effort to challenge and invite mid-career faculty to engage new interests and develop new projects. Any merit system, of course, must recognize and respond to efforts of this kind. Most institutions provide some recognition for excellence in teaching. A parallel award might be given for community service. Community service is often noted as one of the triumvirate of academic responsibilities, yet it is seldom rewarded in a visible manner. An award for community service would, I think, legitimize and make visible the work of many faculty members who are devoting a great deal of time and energy to local efforts.

Earlier we spoke of morale and climate. It is often the condition of life in academic departments that provides the immediate environment for either renewal or discontent. It would be beneficial to make an award of cash each year to those departments that have done the most to support, first, the improvement of teaching and second, the development of new professional interests by the faculty of the department. Debate about the criteria for making these awards would be valuable in and of itself, but making the awards would be a rather dramatic symbol of the emerging values of the university. These awards could convey "permission" for experimentation in the academic community.

"Mini" ACE Fellows Program Award. Each year, the American Council on Education provides opportunities for a number of in-

terns in academic administration. Individual universities could institute programs on the order of the ACE Fellows Program by holding internal competitions for small grants or fellowships, so that faculty interested in an eventual career in administration might attend one of the institutes or workshops offered each summer for administrators or potential administrators. Examples of these programs include the Institute for Educational Management at Harvard and an Institute for Women Administrators held each year at Bryn Mawr in Pennsylvania.

Individual recognition with "challenges." One of the most intriguing ideas for recognizing mid-career faculty is the suggestion by Bevan (1979) of the "distinguished lecturer." Each year one or more members of the faculty could be recognized for outstanding academic contributions by being named university distinguished lecturer. This individual would be freed from all classes for a semester and asked to prepare a small number of broadly based lectures that would then be presented to various classes, faculty groups, and community associations. The lectures would then be published and distributed throughout the university. With some imagination, this idea could be extended to other situations, such as naming distinguished teachers whose duties would include working as mentors with younger faculty or being available to visit classes and provide the faculty member with a confidential evaluation of his or her teaching.

Differentiated staffing. The success of many of the efforts described here depends in large part on the idea of differentiated staffing. To some extent, academic departments must have the flexibility to allow particular faculty members to concentrate for a time on a particular facet of their duties. Thus, if a department had a mid-career professor whose interests had turned totally to teaching, it should be possible to add to his or her teaching load, thus freeing other members of the department for research efforts. Backed by this kind of policy, departments could specify, for example, a total work commitment for a time to a community service project. In this case, the professor could then be evaluated on the quality of his or her contribution to the community.

Banking credits. A related idea explored by Mars Hill College in North Carolina allows professors to teach overloads with the understanding that they can bank the credits ahead for a reduced load or even a semester off at a later date.

Tie into national projects. Association with a number of national educational projects has provided new interests and, importantly, new networks of colleagues to offer support. There are many examples of such projects, but one that has been visible recently is Jerry Gaff's General Educational Models, supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. Gaff's project enabled representatives from a number of institutions to interact with one another about general education and to achieve recognition for themselves, their projects, and their institutions. Universities should be attuned to the emergence of these projects and should encourage *particular* faculty to become associated with them.

Encourage faculty members to take classes from one another. To a limited extent, faculty at many institutions do take courses from one another. They report it to be, in general, an excellent experience. It provides, of course, for the acquisition of new information and ideas, but it also creates new relationships, and it keeps fresh the perspective of the student. It can lead to new interdisciplinary collaborations. Universities should think of ways to increase incentives for this activity, for it holds tremendous value for academic renewal.

Create an ethic of career re-examination. In step with the idea of "life review," it is probably wise for a university administration to underscore, in a number of ways, the idea that its faculty should occasionally and formally examine their career directions, satisfactions, and options. Career examination institutes could be run on campus, or there should be funds available for those who would prefer to engage in this process off campus. It is essential to highlight the idea that attendance at such a workshop need not imply dissatisfaction but a re-examination and refocusing of interests.

Ethical wills and oral histories. In the Jewish tradition, there is a custom of developing ethical wills: statements of what an individual believes important enough to pass on to succeeding generations. Universities should encourage their faculty and staff to contribute such a legacy to a special institutional archive through the writing of an ethical will or the participation in an oral history project prior to retirement. Not only would this provide faculty and staff with an opportunity to contribute to the unfolding life of the university, but it would also provide grist for future historical mills and would convey a sense that the individual was important in the evolution of the institution. We are currently allowing an incredible amount of wisdom to be lost to the historical record with the retirement of each professor.

Wild-card conference competition. A university could further emerging interests if it provided a small amount of funds faculty could draw upon to develop academic on-campus conferences, forums, or workshops around their particular interests. Developing a conference is an absorbing task, and it puts one in immediate touch with leaders in a particular field. Faculty involved in organizing conferences often find that their involvement is a good way to build professional support networks and to come to a more comprehensive understanding of the topic. Establishment of a fund to underwrite several faculty conferences would no doubt draw a number of interesting proposals.

Student interview project. There have been several studies of student development on campuses across the nation in which undergraduate students were interviewed in open-ended fashion on a periodic basis throughout their college careers. Later, many students reported these interviews to be the high point of their college careers. Apparently, they appreciated the opportunity to reflect upon their own development and upon the ideas and issues they were dealing with. Such a project would no doubt be of value to both students and faculty. Many faculty at mid-career lose touch with the culture of undergraduates, and participation in an interview project might be the device to provide genuine insight.

If a project could be devised in which faculty member could interview several students up to three times each academic year, I believe that the university would have great returns on very little investment of time and energy. The insights into undergraduate thought and life would certainly be the source of informed opinion about students, but it could also be the stimulus for projects designed to improve teaching and effectively engage students.

The course on higher education. Many academics complain that their students never gain an understanding of the university and, as graduates, never really represent it well when they get to "high places." Small wonder! We never "officially" discuss the nature of the university with most of them. I have experimented with a course on higher education for undergraduates and have found it to be successful. If such a course were required and faculty from different disciplines were asked to teach it, it could quickly become a forum for debate—especially among faculty of varied persuasions—about the essential character of the modern university. This discussion could be nothing but healthy for the university and those faculty who need to think more broadly about it.

Implementing an environment of opportunity

The ideas noted here are only examples of the moves universities can make both formally and informally to create both the perception and reality of what can be called an "environment of opportunity." All of this, however, must be based upon the idea of each faculty member as a person of great possibility, and it assumes diverse roles which faculty can play in the academic environment. These programs most certainly should not be seen as some form of welfare that would create a second-rate caste of university citizens engaged in academic "busywork." The ideas presented here are likely to interest a particular group of faculty. Others remain committed to productive careers in the traditional disciplines. Still others have withdrawn to the point that their "spiritual" homes are elsewhere, and they are not likely to engage university issues again in meaningful ways.

Several issues do emerge, however, as we consider these ideas. Obviously, no one institution would ever implement all of the suggestions made here. One of the barriers, of course, will be money. In times of shrinking budgets and intensifying competition for available resources, programs with "intangible" benefits are the first to suffer, or to be stillborn. Yet, I would maintain that *all* of the ideas mentioned in this paper could be undertaken for *less* than the amount expended on two associate-professor salaries. Such an expenditure requires both articulate justification and support from central administrators and extended exploration for new sources of funds. Such sources as the university endowment association, or its equivalent, and the alumni association might be willing to pick up pieces of a "renewal package" a particular university might wish to establish.

A major component of implementing the ideas suggested would be that of coordination. Keeping track of the various activities, recruiting faculty for projects, and building community would require the services of at least a half-time coordinator. An administrative staff officer might be assigned these duties, but faculty members given released time could coordinate renewal projects on a rotating basis.

Another set of issues that must be attended to are the "politics" of implementation and persistence: Support from the central administration is essential, yet, for most faculty, the central administration of a university is seen as a distant Olympus. The academic department is where they "live" and departmental attitudes are often seen as the measure of the problems and possibilities of the institution. The paradox is that many current chairpersons have been mandated to build research departments and have little investment in devoting time, energy, and resources to the development of secondary interests that may not seem to be in the best interests of the department—in the short run. These attitudes, I believe, will evolve very slowly. There must be continued leadership from the central administration, ongoing discussion of faculty morale and careers, and a resolve to select chairpersons who have a broad view of the legitimacy of secondary interests.

Another major problem is to be found in our lack of knowledge about the "conditions of vitality" in organizations in general. In assessing opportunity on a particular campus, we would have to be guided by faculty perceptions, examples of emerging projects like those listed earlier, an examination of sabbatical and leave policies, an acquaintance with the reward structure, an accounting of the dollars invested, and a summary of the ways in which various development programs were made known to the faculty. All of these observations, however, remain somewhat speculative and decidedly value-laden. It is difficult, at budget time, to place these needs against the demand for additional faculty in a department producing at capacity. More research into these issues is an important part of efforts to build supports for morale.

Despite the pitfalls and dead-ends, I remain optimistic that universities can move to create more opportunity for many of their mid-career faculty and that these faculty members will respond creatively. For one thing, the tenured faculty position is probably one of the best occupational settings in our society from which one is free to explore emerging interests in some degree of professional security. Indeed, as our list and the experience of many administrators shows, this process is well underway at many colleges and universities.

Designing New Roles In Off-Campus Settings

Louis Brakeman

Why should faculty be encouraged to explore off-campus opportunities? Among the reasons for exploring new off-campus opportunities, the following seem especially noteworthy:

1. For professional growth. Some commentators have urged that ways must be found to provide professional learning opportunities other than research and publication, particularly since few faculty, in fact, do much publishing. Work beyond the campus is one way to enhance professional growth. In some cases, the skills and knowledge gained via an internship, for example, will be directly transferable back to campus.
2. For change of scene. Whatever the environmental factors may be, it is helpful to be away. Persons come back refreshed and enriched. New perspectives from other work settings, new patterns of activity, and insights gained in a new setting can help one to redefine one's role in an academic environment.
3. To develop career consciousness. A self-conscious look at one's own career can be a part of a well-planned internship. One might work up a deliberate plan for professional growth, engage in dialogue with colleagues and administrators about one's career, or even engage in explicit career and life planning by attending workshops or reading books. Certainly one would gain greater sensitivity to the career concerns of students.
4. To contribute to society. Many faculty have skills to offer and knowledge and perspectives to bring to bear on problems outside academia. A symbiotic partnership might be established each benefiting from the other by increased understanding of problems and solutions. Links can be made between what seem to be disparate worlds and perspectives. Barriers in town-gown relations might be lowered and patterns of ongoing cooperation encouraged.
5. To establish networks. Individuals could be linked in various ways; recent academic research could be funneled to organizations and an understanding of implementation dilemmas could help shape research. Contacts could be made for future employment.
6. To develop empathy for student interns. Faculty would learn how to cope with a new setting, how to translate academic experience into skillful actions, and how to serve as mentors for their students who participate in internships.

Another range of reasons for considering non-campus involvement by faculty relates to program discontinuation, college closings, people feeling closed in the wrong career. A further set of reasons is related to faculty personnel planning. The costs, in financial and other terms, of an aging faculty, the consequences of the increase in the mandatory retirement age, the need to respond to shifts in student enrollment, and the commitment to increase the number of women and minority faculty are all institutional concerns that will encourage administrators to facilitate faculty involvement beyond the campus in the hope that some faculty will choose to change careers.

What opportunities are really out there? How might competent faculty be used in business, in government, and in the non-profit sector? We should be open to a wide *degree of involvement*, ranging from having a colleague in a non-academic organization with whom we discuss common interests, to consulting, to brief or extensive internships. One activity may lead to another; each will provide stimulation.

Business: There are small local businesses and large national and multi-national corporations. Certain businesses are more open than others. Those firms likely to be receptive will be growth businesses, especially high-technology firms, firms with progressive personnel policies for their own managers, firms that hire from the outside into middle-level positions, firms that require or seek outside advice, firms that have accepted the fact that societal values are changing, and firms whose managerial personnel have college degrees.

Faculty in some disciplines, of course, already serve as consultants and employees to business to an extensive degree. Engineering faculty, computer scientists, business administration faculty, faculty with other technical expertise such as agriculture specialists, move to business and to government and back to the university. The flow to and from such places as Bell Labs is regular and extensive. Price Waterhouse offers short-term opportunities, mostly to accounting faculty, to observe their operation. Westinghouse consults regularly with engineers from academe.

What follows is a list of some of the needs of business, and the areas in which faculty might work:

- marketing research
- educational programs for managers in human relations, communication, and problem-solving
- data-processing, including systems analysts (some of these people need not have computer backgrounds, the task is to work with user groups—to devise systems to answer problems)

- problem-solving; organization development; advising on process; work on productivity issues
- training and development
- writing—for both internal and external publications
- research and development
- part-time consulting (related to discipline)
- high-technology including the translation of instructional material into a computer mode
- social responsibility officer
- corporate planning—environmental impact
- library work
- affirmative action work

Government: In the past, a number of faculty have secured experience in the federal government through the mechanism of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act. The purpose of this act is "to provide for the temporary assignment of personnel between the federal government and state, local, and Indian tribal governments, institutions of higher education, and certain other organizations for work of mutual concern and benefit."

The assignment of faculty to a federal agency is normally for one or two years, implemented by written agreement, and arranged on a decentralized basis with a particular agency. Coordinators exist in most agencies.

Interested individuals should consult the fellowship and internship opportunities available in Washington, D.C., as catalogued in publications of the Association of American Colleges and the National Society for Internships and Experiential Learning.

The non-profit sector: Non-profit organizations, from art museums to mental health clinics, certainly could use faculty as curators, researchers, counselors, writers, analysts, and the like. The difficulty is apt to be compensation. On the other hand, if the faculty member's involvement is part-time, compensation may not be a barrier. Faculty might consider such non-profit settings as the following:

- the Lutheran World Federation in Tanzania
- an urban ministry
- a state historical society
- an opera company
- the Institute for World Order and the American Friends Service Committee
- an agency working on urban problems
- hospitals and counseling agencies
- a public radio station, developing dramas for broadcast

- an art museum developing educational programs related to a major exhibition

What principal difficulties stand in the way, and how might these be overcome? The first set of difficulties might be labeled "cultural." A research job in the non-profit sector might be quite similar to a research job at a university. But when we move into the world of business and industry, the differences in culture may become striking.

Faculty value their autonomy, their professionalism, their commitment to their discipline and the ethic of service. They lead somewhat isolated lives, by and large set their own schedules, rarely work as members of teams or groups, distrust the profit motive, and do not especially value power. They tend not to relate to persons in professions other than their own.

In the world of business, the "bottom line" is crucial. One works with colleagues extensively; one's schedule and agenda are set by others; results are required even if all the information is not in and all the arguments have not been examined. Action, not reflection, is the mode. The Ph.D. credential is not valued highly, the bright and critical academic may be feared, the impractical and untested-by-reality bent of a college teacher may be scorned. These difficulties will be more or less relevant depending on the nature, especially the intensity, of the involvement undertaken. They are powerful forces; they operate at the emotional level; and their importance may be overlooked by those eager to get involved.

Difficulties at a personal level are those associated with faculty at mid-career. One of the greatest problems is apt to be a profound sense of incompetence—of not feeling good about one's career, abilities, and of being scared of the future. Business leaders are apt to wonder why a person in mid-career wants to change. The one-life, one-career imperative will be at work. The person will not know, perhaps quite literally, what he or she is able to do other than teach and do conventional research in a regular subject. There are apt to be family responsibilities, financial and psychological, a spouse with a career, a house with a mortgage, established relationships, and so on. Many changes all at once, or a sense that a career shift would involve many changes, is likely to produce uneasiness.

A third set of difficulties has to do with competencies. What can the faculty person do and what does the organization need to have accomplished? The faculty member will need to do some self-analysis, to identify transferable skills. Many faculty are good at problem-solving; many have sophisticated analytical skills. They are experienced communicators and many are skilled in interpersonal relationships. They are independent, able to learn, self-motivated, and have a range of interests. Obviously, not all faculty have these competencies, but many do and the nature of the work makes it likely that most faculty would possess these talents at least to some degree.

Work needs to be done in identifying competencies sought by business, government, and other organizations and in assisting faculty to think through their competencies in terms useful to non-collegiate organizations.

There are difficulties associated with compensation and a host of specific questions having to do with possible relocation. These need to be worked out in specific cases, most appropriately on a one-to-one basis between the faculty member and the responsible person in the receiving organization.

Finally, how does one begin? The question assumes, correctly, that many faculty will be reluctant to take the initiative. Those who wish to venture into off-campus settings may need encouragement and assistance.

Of central importance is a supportive environment on campus. Faculty must be assured that their off-campus involvement will not threaten their financial or professional security, or their opportunities for advancement. Policies ought to permit and even encourage off-campus involvement, with appropriate regard for the maintenance of on-campus responsibilities. Leadership and support for faculty initiative must come from the chief academic officer and the president. Opportunities for counseling and self-assessment might be provided. Model programs from other colleges and local examples of involvement are useful forms of encouragement.

In considering outside involvement, what a professor does may well depend on why he or she is looking. There are, however, some basic starting points that can be helpful:

- Conduct informational interviews with people in non-campus settings, using a set of questions designed to enhance understanding of how the organization works
- Communicate with members of the college or university board of trustees for advice and contacts
- Become active in off-campus organizations
- Talk to alumni about their work and their careers
- Enroll in a course in business management
- Carry out a research effort with someone from another organization
- "Take a recruiter to lunch"
- Start consulting, drawing on professional expertise, perhaps in a research area
- Arrange an internship of a few months to a year or more
- Take a "tour" of a business or several businesses

- Bring an executive to campus for conversation
- Find a friend "outside," a colleague with whom to discuss mutual problems
- Establish a co-mentor arrangement – work out a specific plan for each to help the other
- Hold a corporate/government/faculty discussion on the nature of the workplace
- Do a survey of alumni who have Ph.D's to see what kinds of jobs they have.

Finally, and above all else, remember that the best cooperative relationships are based on mutual self-interest. Faculty are not the university's gifts to other institutions; and off-campus institutions are not charities. The benefits from any cooperative relationship must be mutual and real. Ways must be explored by which each institution can contribute to the vitality of the other. Such explorations will take a good deal of time – time to move from general to specific problems, interests, and mutual gains.

Resources

Literature

Alpert, Richard M. "Professionalism and Educational Reform: The Case of Hampshire College." *The Journal of Higher Education* 51 (September/October 1980): 497-518.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *Missions of the College Curriculum*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Baldwin, Roger G. and Blackburn, Robert T. "The Academic Career as a Developmental Process: Implications for Higher Education." *The Journal of Higher Education* (In press).

Bevan, John M. "Faculty Evaluation and Institutional Rewards." *Improving Undergraduate Education in the South*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board. 1979.

Brakeman, Louis and Potter, David. "Internships for Faculty." *Experiential Education* 4 (September-October 1980): 1-4.

Cantwell, W. Richard. "The Ph.D. Job Crisis: Past, Present, and Future." *Trends 2000* (Annual Review Issue, 1979). Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1979.

Edgerton, Russell. "Perspectives on Faculty." Keynote address to the Kansas Conference on Postsecondary Education, Topeka, Kansas, November 18, 1980.

Faculty Career Development. Current Issues in Higher Education, No. 2. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979.

Furniss, W. Todd. *Reshaping Faculty Careers*. Washington, D.C. American Council on Education, 1981.

Gould, Roger. *Transformations: Growth and Change in Adult Life*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. "Changing the Shape of Work: Reform in Academe." *Perspectives on Leadership*. Current Issues in Higher Education, No. 1. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979.

Katz, Donald R. "Lament of the Gypsy Scholars." *Esquire*. October 1980, pp. 35-39.

Ladd, Everett Carll. "The Work Experience of American College Professors: Some Data and an Argument." *Faculty Career Development*. Current Issues in Higher Education, No. 2. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979.

Levinson, D. J.; Darrow, C. N.; Klein, E. B.; Levinson, M. H.; and McKee, B. *The Seasons of a Man's Life*. New York: Knopf, 1978.

Light, Donald, Jr. "Introduction: The Structure of the Academic Professions." *Sociology of Education* 47 (Winter 1974): 2-28.

Lovett, Clara M. "Difficult Journey: Senior Academics and Career Change." *AAHE Bulletin* 33 (September 1980): 8-10, 13.

Palmer, David D. and Patton, Carl V. "Mid-Career Change Options in Academe: Experience and Possibilities." *The Journal of Higher Education* 52 (July/August 1981): 378-398.

Rice, R. Eugene. "Recent Research on Adults and Careers: Implications for Equity, Planning, and Renewal." Study paper commissioned by National Institute of Education, December 1979.

Sarason, Seymour B. *Work, Aging, and Social Change: Professionals and the One Life-One Career Imperative.* New York: Free Press, 1977.

Sheehy, Gail M. *Passages: Predictable Crises of Adult Life.* New York: E. P. Dutton, 1976.

Toombs, William. "Planning a Program for Career Change." University Park, Pa.: Center for the Study of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University, 1978.

Resource Persons

Roger G. Baldwin, project director, Academic Careers Unlimited, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036

Robert Barry, director, Career Development Program, Loyola University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60626

John M. Bevan, vice president for academic affairs, College of Charleston, Charleston, South Carolina 29401

Louis Brakeman, provost, Denison University, Granville, Ohio 43023

Russell Edgerton, president, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036

Jon W. Fuller, president, Great Lakes Colleges Association, 220 Collingwood, Suite 240, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103

W. Todd Furniss, senior academic advisor and director, Office of Academic Affairs, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20036

Janet Hagberg, The Hagberg Company, 5248 Humboldt Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55408

Peggy Heim, senior research officer, TIAA-CREF, 730 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10017

Clara Lovett, assistant provost and associate professor of history, Bernard Baruch College, City College of New York, 17 Lexington Avenue, Box 314, New York, New York 10010

Thomas H. Maher, director, Center for Professional Development, Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas 67208

Eugene Rice, professor of sociology, University of the Pacific, 3601 Pacific Avenue, Stockton, California 95211

Mary Somers, project director, Scholars in Transition, Institute for Research in History, 55 West 44th Street, New York, New York 10036

William Toombs, director, Center for the Study of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802